

HEBRAICA.

VOLUME I.

OCTOBER, 1884.

NUMBER 2.

THE SYLLABLES IN THE HEBREW LANGUAGE.

BY HERMANN L. STRACK, PH.D.,

Professor of Theology in the University of Berlin.

It is not my purpose, at this place, to take part in the discussion on "Intermediate Syllables," commenced by Professor Dodd and Rabbi Felsenthal, but, rather, merely to show how the whole subject of syllables in Hebrew can be clearly put forth for the beginner, so that he may be sufficiently prepared for a real understanding of the various forms of the language. I hope that, through such a discussion of the various points that come into play in the matter of syllables in Hebrew, some light may also be thrown on what are called "Intermediate Syllables." It will be clear, from what follows, why I make use of the technical term "loosely-closed syllable" (*lose geschlossene Silbe*). Right here may I be permitted to call the attention of the reader to the term "opened syllables," which, so far as I know, is a new term. For the purpose of getting a better general view of the subject, I have almost entirely omitted all mention of exceptions. The majority of exceptions are to be explained on the basis of euphony (לְהַפְאֵרֶת הַקְרִיָּאָה, as the Jewish grammarians say); because the sacred writings of the Old Testament were, and still are, chanted in solemn rhythm in the synagogues. I wish to add, further, that the following explanation is not contained in my Hebrew grammar,¹ and is, thus, an important addition to it.

§ A. BEGINNING OF SYLLABLES.—Every syllable, and hence, also, every word, *must begin with a consonant*, that is,

(a) Neither with a vowel (an exception is found only in וְ conjunctive, *e. g.*, וְדָבָר . . . וְבֵית . . . וְמֶלֶךְ);

NOTE.—Before labials, the Babylonian system of punctuation has וּ, *i. e.*, וּ.

§ B. Nor with two consonants. When the first letter of a syllable (or of a word) has no vowel of its own, then it receives *sh'wâ* mobile (*cf.* my grammar, § 5, b), and, in the case of אֵהָהּ, Hāṭēph (§ 5, c; § 10, a, 3).

§ C. CLOSE OF SYLLABLES.—Here we distinguish

I. *Open Syllables*, *i. e.*, syllables closing with a vowel, *e. g.*, אֵשִׁית . . . קוֹמוּ, אֲתוּ (on הָ *cf.* § 2, b). These syllables always have long vowels.

¹ Hebraeische Grammatik; mit Uebungsstueken, Literatur und Vokabular. Zum Selbststudium und fuer den Unterricht. Von Hermann L. Strack. Karlsruhe und Leipzig: H. Reuter. New York: B. Westermann & Co. Chicago: American Publication Society of Hebrew. xvi., 163 pp. 2 Mark 70 pf.

Exceptions are found in the verbal suffixes (§ 76, e) **נִי** (ānî), in which the liquid can be regarded as virtually doubled.

NOTE.—Syllables closing with **ס** are considered open, e. g., **קָטַל**, but **מָצַח** (cf. § 10, c, 1).

§ D. Unaccented syllables, with long vowels, are open; the sh'wâ following them is the sh'wâ mobile, e. g., **שְׁמֵרִים** shô-m'rîm.

§ E. II. *Closed Syllables*, i. e., those ending in a consonant, e. g., **קָטַל** (second syllable). They are called doubly closed, when the consonant closing the syllable is followed by another consonant in the same word, e. g., **מִצֹּרֶה** (first syllable), **קָטַל** (second syllable). When the two consonants are the same, i. e., when the vowel is followed by a consonant with a dāghēsh, this syllable is also called sharpened, e. g., **הִשְׁשִׁי** (first and second syllables).

§ F. Unaccented closed syllables always have short vowels, e. g., **מִבְּדִיל** (first syllable), **יֶלֶד** (first), **וַיָּקֻם** wäyyāqōm (first, third), **וַיָּמָת** (first, third).

§ G. Unaccented syllables with short vowels are closed, e. g., **קָטַלְתָּם** (first).

§ H. In closed Penultima with tone, we find only the following vowels: (1) the tone-long vowels ā, ē, ō; hence neither î nor û, nor the vowels naturally long, or long by contraction, namely, â, ê, ô; (2) the short vowels ä, ě, e. g., **מִמְנו . . קָטַלְתָּ**.

§ I. In closed Ultima with tone, any long vowel may occur; of the short vowels, sometimes the ĩ, e. g., the two particles **אִם** (if), **עִם** (with), which, however, often (as is always done in the case of **מִן**) becomes toneless when māqqēph is used, and the form **וַיִּשָּׁב** (§ 72, n, a).

Especially worthy of note are

§ K. III. *The Opened Syllables*, i. e., syllables which really close doubly, but in which this is avoided by means of a helping-vowel.

(1) *At the end of words.* An ordinary helping-vowel (exceptions, § 11, i), generally S'ghôl, but also (especially if the last, or next to the last syllable, is a guttural) Pättāh. Then the vowel of the open syllable, if with tone, generally is lengthened, namely, ō to ē, as, e. g., **קָדַשׁ . . רָחַב . . אָרַח**, for qōdhsh, rōḥb, ōrh; ĩ to ē, e. g., **סָפַר . . שָׁמַע**, for šīphr, šīm'; ä to ě, e. g., **וָרַע . . מָלַךְ**, for mālĥ, zār' (cf. § 27, c, d).

§ L. If the next to the last letter is a guttural, then ä remains unchanged in the open syllable, e. g., **נָעַר** (§ 27, e), **דָּעַת . . תּוֹכַחַת** (§ 35, a), **וַיַּעַל** (§ 72, n, e), hence short vowel.

§ M. In the apocopated imperfect of the verbs **לָה**, the lengthening of ĩ to ē frequently does not take place, e. g., **יָגַל** for yāgl, **וַיִּבֶן** (cf. § 72, n, γ).

§ N. If the next to the last letter is ĩ, then Hîrēq is used as a helping-vowel, Pättāh is retained in open syllables, as, e. g., **עֵין** (§ 28, a); thus also in the suffix form **יְיָ**, e. g., **אֱלֹהֶיךָ**, "your (fem.) God;" as also in the dual ending **יָם**.

§ O. (2) *In the middle of words.* The first closing consonant, if it is a guttural, frequently, in order to ease the pronunciation, receives the hātēph corresponding to the preceding vowel; and, in this case, this vowel is not lengthened. Examples (in § 10, a, 4); **נָעַרְוּ**, to be divided **נָעַרְוּ**, nā'a-rô.

§ P. The vowel is also not lengthened, when, instead of the hātēph,

on account of a sh'wâ following it, the corresponding short vowel is employed (cf. § 5, e), e. g., יְחִזְקוּ, first plural יְחִזְקוּ, to be divided יְחִזְקוּ, yěhěz-qû; יְחִלּוּ, first plural יְחִלּוּ, to be divided יְחִלּוּ.

§ Q. IV. *Loosely-closed Syllables* we call those which were originally followed by a vowel, which, however, in accordance with the laws of etymology, (§§ 11, c, 2, and 11, d) fell away. The "loose close" can be seen, from the fact that the letters בִּנְרַכֵּךְ remain aspirated. The sh'wâ cannot be heard, and is *not* sh'wâ mobile. Examples (in § 11, c, 2), כִּנָּה, dual, with suffix, כִּנְפֵיהֶם, kân-phê-hêm (§ 24, d), מַלְאֲכִים, suffix מַלְאֲכֵיהֶם (§ 27, g); חֲרַבְתִּיךְ, ḥôr-bhō-thăyikh (§ 34, a). In § 11, d, e. g., יַעֲמֹד, plural יַעֲמֹדוּ, to be divided yă'ăm-dhû (§ 63, e); נֶאֱסַף, plural נֶאֱסַפּוּ (§ 63, g); יַחֲרֹד, plural יַחֲרֹדוּ (§ 63, f).

§ R. Loosely closed are also those syllables which originated from the union of the prefixes בִּ. כִּ. לִ with words whose first consonant had a sh'wâ under it, e. g., לִדְבַר (§ 11, g, 2), from דִּבְרַר+lă. Exceptions are found with ל before the Inf. Qāl. (cf. § 53, c, where לִקְבַר, from קִבַר+lă (לִ) is mentioned).

§ S. Very rarely is a loosely closed syllable found where no vowel has been omitted (cf. § 27, m), cf. also הַבֵּיתָה (*accus. loci*), for which word, according to § 19, b, a, the ground-form, bāyt, is to be presupposed. A fixed closed syllable is found, contrary to the rule, in בִּרְכַת (*stat. const.*), of בִּרְכָה (§ 33, d), and in חֲרָפוֹת (*stat. const.*), of חֲרָפוֹת (§ 34, c), cf. also בִּשְׁפָכָה (§ 53, d).

METHODS IN HEBREW GRAMMARS.

BY PROF. GEORGE H. SCHODDE, PH.D.,

Columbus, Ohio.

To understand and master a language implies more than the mere mechanical acquisition of its facts. It means the study of a language from a philological standpoint, an examination of its grammar and lexicon for the purpose of learning its inner character and being, and in order to be able to understand rationally and philosophically the phenomena of the speech. Whitney¹ says of the linguistic student: "He deals with language as the instrument of thought, its means of expression, not its record; he deals with simple words and phrases, not with sentences and texts. He aims to trace out the inner life of language, to discover its origin, to follow its successive steps of growth, and to deduce the laws that govern its mutations, the recognition of which shall account to him for both the unity and variety of its present manifested phases; and, along with this, to apprehend the nature of language as a human endowment, its relation to thought, its influence upon the development of intellect and the growth of knowledge, and the history of mind and of knowledge as reflected in it." Necessary as it is to acquire thoroughly and well the data of a language, and to learn these for practical purposes, it will be readily seen that the most interesting and, in many respects, most profitable problems of linguistic study reach out above and beyond these

¹ *Language and the study of Language*, p. 6.

individual facts. Especially has this been recognized in the past few decades, since the comparative method of study, which has been so abundantly fruitful in all departments of learning, has been applied to languages also, and comparative philology has been found so great a power in historical, ethnographical, mythological, and other researches. The soul and life of language has never been so much studied, or so well understood, as at present.

And what is true of language in general is true also of the Semitic tongues in particular; they, too, and here again the Hebrew in particular, have been reaping the benefit of the revolution in method and manner introduced into philology in general. As new problems and aims assumed prominence, new methods in research were adopted, and the departure from the old mechanical systems in grammar and lexicon became more and more radical. *In statu quo* is, at best, a relative phrase, and scarcely anywhere is this more the case than in the department of Semitic studies; here advance and improvement have been decided and marked, and scarcely any feature of this study has made it more attractive than the fact that it (and especially is this true of Hebrew grammar) has, in our leading works on the structure of the language, left the more practical stage, and entered upon that of philosophical and theoretical discussion, in which the philological principles as such, the Hebrew as a special language, as one member of a group or family of tongues, is studied objectively, and for strictly grammatical purposes. While all grammars of the present day, as was the case in the old works, still have the practical aim of making the language of the Old Testament intelligible to the student of God's Word, yet they no longer are written for the sole and only purpose of rendering hand-maid services to exegesis and other theological disciplines. Hebrew is studied now also for its own sake, and its bearings on philology in general and Semitic philology in particular; and has thus assumed an independence and new dignity.¹

This change in the basis and aim of Hebrew grammars is contemporaneous with the introduction of more rational methods into philological discussion in general, and is no more than five or six decades old. It was introduced by a German; and the work of building upon the foundation thus laid has been done almost exclusively by Germans: to the present day there is not in the English language, not even as a translation, a work which can fairly be called a philosophical grammar of the Hebrew language. The nearest approach to it is probably Kalisch. As yet, about all our grammars are rudimentary and elementary, confining themselves strictly to the facts of the language, and only sporadically endeavoring to explain these facts.²

The father of higher Hebrew grammar is Wilhelm Gesenius, who was born in 1786, and, in 1843, died as professor of theology, at Halle. Theodore Benfey³ calls him "the original founder of an independent Semitic philological science, and among the most important representatives of a critical and unprejudiced

¹ It must not be forgotten that such methods and problems have not a mere abstract or philosophical value; in fact, some are productive of many important practical and exegetical results, e. g., the discussion as to whether the interchange of הוּא and הִיא in the so-called Priest Codex is a sign of antiquity or of a later date, and similar points.

² We shall not, however, forget to mention that a number of excellent monographs on special points of grammar have appeared in English, based upon a most thorough study of the language in its whole length and breadth, and *facile princeps* among these is Driver's *Use of the Tenses in Hebrew*. 2nd Edition. Oxford, 1881.

³ In his *Geschichte der neueren Sprachwissenschaft*, 1869, p. 685.

Semitic philology." It is with Gesenius, both as a lexicographer and a grammarian, that English students of Hebrew are better acquainted than with any other of the leading authorities in this department; and this is, at least partly, due to the fact that some of his works have been translated into our language, and his empirical system finds more acceptance among us than do the more abstract systems of others. And yet English scholars apparently make but little use of his two greatest works, namely, his grammatical *Lehrgebäude* and his large lexicon, the *Thesaurus*, which, according to the opinion expressed lately by so good an authority as Professor Strack, of Berlin, is still the best at our command.¹ Gesenius began with the publication of a Hebrew lexicon, in 1810; and out of this grew both his smaller dictionary, in 1815, of which the ninth edition, by Mühlau and Volck, recently appeared, and of which Robinson has made an English translation, as also the *Thesaurus*, a large Hebrew-Latin dictionary of 1522+166 folio pages, completed by Rödiger, in which is collected all that the languages, literature, geography, history, etc., of the Orient could contribute to the explanation of the Old Testament idiom. Both in method and results he was apparently more successful, at least found less opposition, in his lexicographical work than in his grammars. Of these, the first edition of the smaller and best known appeared in 1813; and, at the author's death, thirteen editions had made their appearance. A number of further editions were published by Rödiger, and now the editorship has been entrusted to the capable hands of Kautzsch, who has brought down the work to our own days, in scientific character, and has also added an exercise book. Out of this smaller grammar grew, in 1817, his *Ausführliches grammatisch-kritisches Lehrgebäude der hebräischen Sprache*, an elaborate and exhaustive treatise on Hebrew grammar, comprising 908 closely printed octavo pages; and it is in this work that we find his system and method both explained and carried out. It is the empiric method, the collection of all the data that the language as such offered, and the deduction of the principles from these data. True, his *Lehrgebäude* makes it a special point to compare, wherever possible, what the cognate tongues have to offer in explanation of Hebrew forms and words, but to these is nowhere given a decisive, but only an illustrative voice. He confines himself to the analysis of the language as found in the Old Testament literature, and has very little sympathy for any abstract, philosophical theorizing. In the introduction to his larger grammar (p. III), he says that it was his object to make a complete and critical collection of the grammatical forms, and, on the basis of these, to give a rational explanation. His *Lehrgebäude* is a faithful expression of this aim, and is a work worthy of much more attention than it receives.

Allied in spirit, though later in date, are the massive two volumes of Böttcher (died in 1863) edited by Mühlau, in 1866-68. There is in no language a more complete collection of the data of Hebrew as given in the Old Testament than in this work. While independent in his treatment of the subject, especially in the use of a new nomenclature in the place of the traditional grammatical *termini technici*, Böttcher too insists upon explaining the Hebrew on the basis of Hebrew alone, and differs from and advances upon Gesenius, chiefly in his protest against the authority of Arabic grammar in the arrangement and explanation of the Hebrew.

A linguistic genius, such as appears but once in a generation, was Georg Hein-

¹ *Theol. Literaturblatt*, June 20, 1884.

rich Aug. Ewald, whose career, as remarkable for its excentricities as for its brilliancy, reads almost like a fable. He was born in Göttingen, in 1803, and died there in 1875. His grammar appeared in 1827, as *Kritische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache*; but from the fifth to the present eighth edition it bears the title *Ausführliches Lehrbuch der hebräischen Sprache des Alten Bundes*, 935 pp. Of all the Hebrew grammars that have appeared this is certainly the most philosophical; his method is synthetic and speculative. Not only are the results of Semitic study, but also the principles of philology in general, here allowed to show their influence, and the factors and agencies that combine in the growth and development of the language put into requisition for the explanation of the etymology and word formation in Hebrew. He does not take the facts of the language and then by the process of analysis show how these facts became such, as is the method of Gesenius, but rather, on the other hand, he assumes philological data, and shows how, from the basis of the roots and stems of the language, the gender, cases, tenses and moods grew into what they are now. With Gesenius he endeavors to explain Hebrew from Hebrew alone, at least treats it chiefly as self-explanatory, but, in doing so, follows a course exactly the opposite from the one pursued by his great co-laborer. His views can best be learned in his Introductory, from p. 17—39. His standpoint is further illustrated by the position he takes over against the claims made for the Arabic, in reference to antiquity of form, and utility in the explanation of Hebrew. He says, p. 19:

“Over against the Aramaic languages, which are known to us only in the form they appeared in the last few centuries before Christ, the Hebrew, as it appears in the powerful and mighty language of the prophets and the great poets, is distinguished by a greater fulness and more developed structure, over against the Arabic, which is, indeed, more developed in some points, but in its structure of words and sentences has become as peculiar and inflexible (*starr*) as the Arabic desert, and which appears on the stage of history only 400 years after Christ, it is distinguished by greater antiquity and by its mobile and youthful character. . . . Many features, which in the younger languages have been divided, and in this or that dialect have undergone a peculiar development, the Hebrew still retains in an undivided state. Therefore, the study of the Semitic as a family of languages, must begin especially with the Hebrew, because this language exhibits to us the oldest form of the Semitic in its connection and originality.”

The system of Justus Olshausen (died 1884) is like and unlike that of Ewald. In its general features his *Lehrbuch der hebräischen Sprache*, the first and only volume of which appeared in 1861, is similar to Ewald's in its synthetic character, in building up the grammar from philological and philosophical premises, and endeavoring to follow its gradual growth; but it differs from Ewald in its endeavors to show this procession in its historical unfolding from the original Semitic language, and in finding the materials for this historical basis in the Arabic. His antithesis to Ewald finds expression already on p. 2, where he says, “In reference to the primitive character of the whole linguistic structure, both as to sounds and words, the Hebrew is surpassed by the Arabic.” This he proceeds to prove from historical and linguistic arguments; and concludes with the remark, “that it is evident from what precedes, that the comparison of no cognate language throws so much light upon the Hebrew as does the Arabic.” Proceeding from this standpoint, he gives in his grammar from page 8 to page 30, a complete grammatical scheme, based upon the Arabic, of what he would consider original Semitic forms,

and, in his grammar proper, starts out from these philosophically construed forms to explain the character, origin and meaning of the forms as found in the Old Testament. This principle gives form and character to his whole grammatical work. His system can be called the linguistic-comparative, combined with the historical method. Quite a successful attempt to popularize the method and results of Olshausen, we find in Bickell's *Grundriss der hebräischen Grammatik*, 1869, translated by Professor Samuel Ives Curtiss, Jr., as "Outlines of Hebrew Grammar," 1877.

A synthesis of Ewald and Olshausen we have in the *Lehrbuch der hebräischen Grammatik*, published 1879, by Professor B. Stade, in Giessen, who thus endeavors to do for Hebrew what Nöldeke has done for the Aramaic languages. He seeks to work only with the acknowledged correct principles of philology, but at the same time takes into consideration only the materials that are really at hand in the Old Testament, and has quite successfully combined the principles as advocated by these two great grammarians. His object, in doing so, was to give a correct picture of the Hebrew language as really existing. (*Vorwort*, p. v.)

The last on the list is the *Historisch-kritisches Lehrgebäude der hebräischen Sprache*, by Dr. Friedrich Eduard König, of Leipzig, of which the first volume, treating of the script, the pronunciation, the pronoun and the verb, appeared in 1881. His method is partly new and partly old. He virtually returns to the analytic manner of Gesenius and Böttcher, but with many improvements, and is more scientific; he is, further, historical, inasmuch as he endeavors to trace the development of existing forms out of the older, which he, too, finds, for the most part, in the Arabic; he follows out the principles of the physiology of sound (*Lautphysiologie*), which seeks to explain on a rational basis the nature of the letter-sounds, their influence on each other, their changes, etc. A distinguishing feature of the work is the fact that it is a commentary on all other grammars, by presenting the *status controversiae* on all the disputed points of grammar, and by the discussion of the *pros* and *cons* offered by the various grammarians. There is no other grammar that gives so clear an insight into the real questions of Hebrew grammar, its interrogation points and problems, and in general such a complete survey of the whole field of inquiry, as does the work of König.

It may not be out of place here to remark that the studies of Assyriologists have as yet produced but few, if any, tangible or important results for Hebrew grammar; their treasures have yielded good gold for Hebrew lexicography chiefly, and not for Hebrew grammar. The discussion now going on between the "Arabic" and the "anti-Arabic," or Assyrian schools, is almost entirely in the department of the dictionary. The protest raised by the younger Delitzsch and others against the methods of the editors of Gesenius' Dictionary is exclusively against the use, or abuse, of Arabic for the explanation of the meaning of Hebrew words, and the antithesis of the protestants is that rather the Assyrian should utter the decisive voice in this regard, whenever comparisons with the dialects are made. But in no perceptible manner have the recent Assyrian researchers influenced the methods of Hebrew grammarians.

ON A HEBREW MANUSCRIPT OF THE YEAR 1300.

BY CYRUS ADLER.

Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore.

Manuscript copies of the Hebrew Bible are comparatively rare, and, considering the antiquity of the books which compose it, extremely modern. Writers vaguely allude to a manuscript of the 9th century, but its existence cannot be verified.¹ The oldest MS. in the Erfurt Library, and, according to Lagarde, the oldest extant copy of the Massora, has been assigned the date of 1100 (Symmicta, p. 137). The oldest Hebrew MS. Bible in the *Bibliothèque Imperiale* (Derenbourg's *Catalogues des Manuscrits Hebreux et Samaritains de la B. I.*) is 1286. Moreover, many of the early MSS., and even some of the early prints, are unpunctuated. The most complete MS. of the Pentateuch and commentaries in the *Bibliothèque Imperiale* is in this condition.² Such also is the case with the large number of MS. copies of the Pentateuch now extant, and they labor under the additional disadvantage of all being multiplications of one original. This unfortunate state of affairs leaves us no facts on which to study the history of the vowel points, and makes textual criticism a hazardous undertaking.

With this preface, a MS. of considerable interest may now be introduced. It is at present the property of Mayer Sulzberger, Esq., of Philadelphia, and was purchased by him from the late Dr. Wickersham, who had himself bought it from Professor Vincenzo Gustale, now living at Florence, Italy. It was sold as a MS. of the year 1300, and was pronounced, from an examination of the handwriting (by Rabbi Iesi, of Ferrara), to be of that date. Our first purpose is to ascertain whether there be any internal evidence to corroborate these statements.

The MS. contains סליחות, or rather תחנונים, that is, supplicatory prayers recited by Jews between New Years day and the day of Atonement. Its first part agrees exactly, even to the arrangement, with a collection made by the great Italian scholar, Samuel David Luzzato, except that, where his edition reads "here the reader says any prayer which he pleases," our MS. has always inserted one—a confirmation of both the correctness of the editor and the antiquity of the MS. That it was the custom to insert poetical invocations at these places is proved by a MS. (No. 630 of the Catalogue) preserved in the *Bibliothèque Imperiale*. Its title is סדר תחנונים; and, of the six poetical invocations inserted, five correspond with those in our MS., viz:—

מצירי ערי . . . יעירוני רעיוני . . . אעירה . . . שחר קמתי . . . אלהי

Our MS. possesses three such poems which can be recognized (two from their acrostics, and the third from its having lived even to our own time) and which may furnish some evidence in regard to its date. The first, the acrostic of which is דניאל, is a poem of no merit. It was probably written by an Italian of the twelfth century, though the single name of Daniel is so common, that nothing positive can be asserted concerning him. The next is the famous ברכי נפשי of

¹ Such a MS. was reported to exist in the Parma Library. An inquiry concerning it has not elicited a reply from the Librarian, Abbe Perreau.

² In the celebrated collection of MSS. of Rabbi David Oppenheimer, now a part of the Bodleian Library, the oldest MS. is an unpunctuated one of the Pentateuch, of the year 1288. No. 107 of the catalogue is the oldest punctuated text in his collection. It is a copy of the Psalms, no older than the fourteenth, and possibly as late as the sixteenth century.

Bahya ibn Bakoda, who flourished about the year 1100. The third, and for us most important, connects itself, in three ways, with the name of Menaḥem Reganati. The acrostic is מנחם הקטן ב' רבי בנימן חזק ואמין ואמן "Menaḥem, the little one" being the humble way in which people ordinarily describe themselves. The poem has a superscription, תחנה שחברה מרנא ורבנא הרב ר' מנחם ז' צל איש ריקאנאטי and lastly we have the subscription, or signature, of the author, giving his name as it occurs in the acrostic.

Before attempting to draw any conclusions from these statements, it will be fitting to describe, in detail, the arrangements of the MS. It consists of thirty-four leaves, of mingled parchment and vellum, and is written by a hand which can unhesitatingly be pronounced as that of a professional scribe. The leaf is $8\frac{1}{2}$ inches long, and $12\frac{1}{2}$ inches broad; and, from the ageing of the edges, this would seem to have been their original size. The formation of the letters is, to some extent, peculiar. The *aliph* is formed thus, א; the *pe* thus, פ—so that *pe* and *fe* are not distinguished except by the *raphe* mark; the *he* thus, ה—he with *mapiq* not being differentiated; there is no distinction between ח and ך; ן and ך are distinguished only by the shading of the latter, which makes it identical with the printed ן; ן is followed very closely by ן or ך, especially the latter, the two almost appearing to form a compound letter. On the top of the first page there are two lines and a half written in a style of Hebrew known as Cursive Italian. They are much blurred and obscured, and were not written by the person who wrote the MS. As far as the inscription could be deciphered, it reads as follows:

לזכרון טוב יהוה אמין
... כה"ר יצחק מריקאנטי... מכר לי זה התחנונים וקבל מירי... משה
רפאיל בן כמוה"ר הרופא יוסף נ"ע... גר ותשב(?)

The top line is merely an invocation, "May this be for a good memorial. Amen;" then a break; then, "Rabbi Isaac, of Reganati;" another break; then, "sold me this book of supplications, and received from me;" another break—probably the price; then comes the name, "Moses Raphael, son of Rabbi Doctor Joseph, son of—(?)"

The above inscription warrants us in concluding that Isaac Reganati either wrote the MS. himself, or, if he was not a scribe, hired one to do it for him. That Isaac Reganati was a contemporary and immediate successor of Menaḥem, we may infer from the fact of his having preserved the poem; for nothing short of filial affection could have induced him to that step. Menaḥem Reganati died in 1290, and is known to the modern world only as a great Kabbalist. From these facts, as well as from the inscription, from the poem of Bakoda and that of Daniel, joined with the tradition and the opinion of the expert referred to, I think it safe to assume that the MS. before us is one of the latter part of the thirteenth, or of the earlier part of the fourteenth century.

And now the question arises, Does any more interest attach to this than to any other antiquarian curiosity? In view of the statements made above, concerning the rarity of early MSS. of the Bible, even unpunctuated, the discovery, in so old a MS. as this, of some part of the Scriptures punctuated, however small that part of it may be, must be of some value.

Scattered among these supplicatory prayers are thirteen Psalms; and a

comparison has yielded some points which are of considerable importance from a historical, as well as grammatical, point of view.

The variations in the text, while not very numerous, are striking. In Ps. cxxxviii., 7, it reads וְתוֹשִׁיעֵנִי וְתִאֲחֹזֵנִי, for וְתוֹשִׁיעֵנִי; though the latter is given in the margin. In Ps. xxviii., 7, we read עֵזִי וּמִגְנִי, for עֵזִי וּמַעֲזִי; and the former is certainly the more poetical expression. In Ps. cxli., 8, the *quadralitarum*, יְהוָה, is written אֱלֹהִים. In Ps. cviii., 9, for לִי, we have וְלִי, in the passage לִי גִלְעָד לִי מִנְשָׁה. In Ps. xlvi., 7, הארץ occurs in place of ארץ. In xlvi., 9, אֱלֹהִים is inserted after יְהוָה. Ps. lxxxvi., 6, לִקְוֹל for בִּקְוֹל; and with הַקְשִׁיבָה this is an allowable construction (cf. Ps. v., 3, and Is. xlviii., 18). Ps. xxviii., 3, the whole passage—וְעַם פְּעָלִי אֵין רַבִּי שְׁלוֹם עִם רַעְהֶם—is omitted in the text, and is added above in a different handwriting. אֲרָנִי is frequently abbreviated to double *yod*. We have fifty-six *scriptiones plenæ*, and eight *defectivæ*, which do not occur in the ordinary text.

If we but remember the extreme strictness of the rules which bound the scribes, the Massorah,¹ which counted the letters, the notions about the mystical value of writing the name of God in a certain way, we cannot but conclude that the writer of this little work had before him a text of the Bible differing materially from the *textus receptus*.

An examination of the vowel points proved even more interesting. The appended notes show over five hundred variations; and the table will give some idea as to where they lie. Three hundred are taken up in a confusion of *qames*, *pathah*, and *hatef-pathah*. The pre-tonic *qames*, as in דֹּר וְדֹר . . עֶרֶב וּבֹקֶר, is unknown; the article frequently does not take a *qames* before the gutturals; אֲשֶׁר is written with *qames*, instead of *hatef pathah*; on the other hand, עַל followed by *maqaf*, is pointed with *hatef-pathah*.

It may be suggested that all this results from pure ignorance; but the fact that all the בְּנֵי־רַכֶּכֶת, without the *dagesh*, have the *raphe* marked, is itself sufficient evidence that the MS. has been carefully written. Of course, it would be ludicrous to suppose that one MS. of this kind could overthrow a well established system; nor do I attempt to draw any definite conclusions from the facts gathered. Yet it would seem that we have here an absolutely phonetic system of representation, without a knowledge of some of the rules of Hebrew Grammar which, at best, seem arbitrary.

A study of the consonantal characters, and a comparison with a MS. of the twelfth century, have suggested another point. It seems rather unusual that the Hebrew characters should, with the exception of five terminals, consist entirely of initials; but these two MSS. seem to show that the MS. style, at least, possessed medials as well. The present square characters correspond exactly to the initials, and have only been in exclusive use since the invention of printing.

The peculiarities of punctuation seem to show that Qamhi's² grammatical system was not without opponents. Aben Ezra asserts that there were but seven

¹ In Ps. cxlii., 7, there is a punctuation which shows an absence of Massoretic tradition. The word מִרְדָּפִי, with the note פֶּתַח בְּאֵתְנַח, is punctuated מִרְדָּפִי. Cf. also note to Ps. cxxxviii., 2.

² I write the name Qamhi, because there are three MSS. of his מְכֻלֹּל in the *Bibliothèque Impériale*, in which it is pointed in that way. See the interesting discussion in the *Athenæum*, March 22, 1884.

vowels; and Judah ha Levi confirms this statement.¹ Luzzato's studies resulted in the same conclusion.² Comparative grammar will also militate against this system. Even such a complex language as Ethiopic has but seven vowels.

As was remarked before, one MS. is not enough to warrant any positive inferences. Yet I think that these facts are important enough to deserve the attention of editors of future critical editions.

NOTE. In the following presentation, the English spelling of Hebrew words is that of the author of the article; an exception was made in the case of this article for reasons apparent to all. Tsadhe, however, is represented by *s*, and not by *c* with Cedilla, as the author would have had it.—[ED.]

PSALM LXV. סה

1. לִמְנַצֵּחַ Dagesh wanting in צ.
2. רַמְיָה Hatef-qames (◌ֿ) under ר for qibbus (◌ֿ).
יִשְׁלֶם Qames (◌ֿ) under ל for pathah (◌ֿ).
3. תַּפְלָה Dagesh wanting in ת.
עֲרִיָּה Hatef-pathah (◌ֿ) under ע for qames (◌ֿ). Sere (◌ֿ) under ר for seghol (◌ֿ).
- יבֹאוּ Scriptio plena.
4. עֲנוּתָה Scriptio plena.
מִנִּי Sere (◌ֿ) under מ for seghol (◌ֿ).
5. תִּבְחָרָה Qames (◌ֿ) under ח for pathah (◌ֿ). Delitzsch points ב with hatef-pathah; our MS. follows the ordinary shewa simplex.
בִּיתְךָ Sere (◌ֿ) under ת for seghol (◌ֿ). Dagesh wanting in ב.
קִדְשׁ Scriptio plena.
6. בְּצִדְקָה Dagesh wanting in ב.
תַּעֲנֵנִי Qames (◌ֿ) under ת for pathah (◌ֿ).
7. בִּכְחוֹ בִּנְאוֹ Hatef-seghol (◌ֿ) under א for shewa simplex (◌ֿ). Dagesh wanting in ז.
8. יָמִים Qames (◌ֿ) under י for pathah (◌ֿ).
גְּלִיהֶם Qames (◌ֿ) under ג for pathah. Sere (◌ֿ) under ה for seghol (◌ֿ).
וַחֲמוֹן Pathah (◌ֿ) under ה for hatef-pathah (◌ֿ).
9. קִצּוֹת Scriptio plena.
מֵאוֹתֶיךָ Scriptio plena.
מוֹצֵאֵי Shewa simplex (◌ֿ) under צ for qames (◌ֿ).
וְעֶרֶב Shewa simplex (◌ֿ) under ו for qames (◌ֿ).
תִּרְנֵן Dagesh wanting in ת.

¹ See the scholarly article of Dr. Felsenthal, in the *HEBRAICA* for May, p. 64. A discussion of the pre-Qamhi school is beyond the scope of the present paper. May we not hope for a fuller discussion of the subject from Dr. Felsenthal?

² Cf. his "Vehoah 'al hagabala," against the antiquity and authenticity of the *Zohar*.

10. פִּקְדָּתְךָ Pathah (ֿ) under פֿ for qames. Dagesh wanting in פֿ and in תֿ.
הָאָרֶץ Pathah (ֿ) under הָ for qames (ֿ); hatef-pathah (ֿ) under אֶ for qames (ֿ).
- וְתִשְׁקָה Scriptio plena; dagesh wanting in תֿ; shewa simplex (ֿ) under קֿ for hatef-pathah (ֿ); sere (ֿ) under קֿ for seghol (ֿ).
רֶבֶת Qames (ֿ) under רֶ for pathah (ֿ); qames (ֿ) under בֿ for pathah (ֿ).
- מֵלֵא Seghol (ֿ) under לֵ for sere (ֿ).
תִּכְיֶן Dagesh wanting in תֿ.
תִּכְיֶנָּה Dagesh wanting in תֿ.
11. נַחַת Qames (ֿ) under נֶ for pathah (ֿ).
גִּדּוּרָה Scriptio plena; sere (ֿ) under רֶ for seghol (ֿ).
בְּרִיבִים Scriptio plena; dagesh wanting in בֿ.
תְּמוּגָה Shewa simplex (ֿ) under גִּ for hatef-pathah (ֿ) (given as a variant). Sere (ֿ) under גִּ for seghol (ֿ). Scriptio plena.
12. שִׁנַּת Qames (ֿ) under נֶ for pathah (ֿ).
טוֹבָתָה Scriptio plena; sere (ֿ) under תֶּ for seghol (ֿ).
וּמַעֲלִיָּה Sere (ֿ) under לֵ for seghol (ֿ).
דִּשָׁן Pathah (ֿ) under דִּ for qames (ֿ).
13. תַּחֲגִרְנָה Scriptio plena.
14. לִבְשׁוֹ Pathah (ֿ) under לֵ for qames (ֿ); holem (וֿ) with שׁ for shureq (וֿ).
כְּרִים Pathah (ֿ) under כֿ for qames (ֿ).
בָּרֶ Pathah (ֿ) under בֿ for qames (ֿ).

PSALM LXXXVI. פֿו

1. אֲזַנְךָ Hatef-pathah (ֿ) under אֶ for qames (ֿ); seghol (ֿ) under נֶ for shewa simplex (ֿ).
עֲנִי Pathah (ֿ) under עֵ for qames (ֿ).
2. שְׁמֶרָה Hatef-qames (ֿ) under שׁ for qames; pathah (ֿ) under רֶ for qames (ֿ).
נִפְשִׁי Qames (ֿ) under נֶ for pathah (ֿ).
חֲסִיד Hatef-pathah (ֿ) under חֶ for qames (ֿ).
אֲנִי Hatef-pathah (ֿ) under אֶ for qames (ֿ).
עֲבֹדָה Seghol (ֿ) under דִּ for shewa simplex (ֿ).
אֱלֹהֶי Seghol (ֿ) under אֶ for sere (ֿ).

3. הַיּוֹם Dagesh wanting in י.
חֲנִי Hataf-qames (◌ֿ) under ח for qames. Seghol (◌ֿֿ) under נ for sere (◌ֿ).
- אֲדָנִי Written "י".
אֱלִי Seghol (◌ֿֿ) under א for sere (◌ֿ).
4. אֱלִי Seghol (◌ֿֿ) under א for sere (◌ֿ).
אֲדָנִי Written "י".
נַפְשִׁי Qames (◌ֿ) under נ for pathah (◌ֿ).
5. אֲדָנִי Written "י".
וּסְלַח Qames (◌ֿ) under ס for pathah (◌ֿ).
וּרְבִי Qames (◌ֿ) under ר for pathah (◌ֿ).
6. בְּקוֹל Our MS. reads לְקוֹל.
תַּחֲנוּנוֹתֵי Qames (◌ֿ) under ת for pathah (◌ֿ).
7. צִרְתִּי Pathah (◌ֿ) under ר for qames (◌ֿ).
אֶקְרָא Pathah (◌ֿ) under ר for qames (◌ֿ).
8. אֵין Seghol (◌ֿֿ) under א for sere (◌ֿ).
בְּאַלְהִים Pathah (◌ֿ) under ב for qames (◌ֿ). Seghol (◌ֿֿ) under א for hataf-seghol (◌ֿֿֿ).
אֲדָנִי Written "י".
וְאֵין Seghol (◌ֿֿ) under א for sere (◌ֿ).
כִּמְעַשִׂיָּה Qames (◌ֿ) under מ for pathah (◌ֿ). Pathah (◌ֿ) under ע for hataf-pathah (◌ֿֿ).
9. אֲשֶׁר Qames (◌ֿ) under א for hataf-pathah (◌ֿֿֿ).
יְבוֹאוּ Pathah (◌ֿ) under י for qames (◌ֿ).
וְיִשְׁתַּחֲווּ Qames (◌ֿ) under ת for pathah (◌ֿ).
אֲדָנִי Written "י".
וַיִּכְבְּדוּ Shewa simplex (◌ֿ) under י.
10. וַעֲשֵׂה Scriptio plena. Seghol (◌ֿֿ) under ש for sere.
לְבָרִיךְ Qames (◌ֿ) under ב for pathah (◌ֿ).
11. דְּרַכְךָ Qames (◌ֿ) under ד for pathah (◌ֿ). Pathah under ך for qames (◌ֿ).
אֶחָד Pathah (◌ֿ) under א for hataf-pathah (◌ֿֿֿ). Hataf-pathah (◌ֿֿֿ) under ה for pathah. Dagesh wanting in ל.
בְּאַמְתָּךְ Qames (◌ֿ) under א for hataf-pathah (◌ֿֿֿ).

- שֶׁמֶה Seghol (ֿ) under שׁ for hireq. Seghol (ֿ) under מ for shewa simplex (ֿ).
12. אֲדָנִי Written "אֲדָנִי".
 אֱלֹהֵי Qames (ֿ) under ה for pathah (ֿ).
 וְאֶכְבְּדָה Pathah (ֿ) under א for hatef-pathah (ֿ). Qames (ֿ) under כ for pathah (ֿ).
13. עֲלִי Pathah (ֿ) under ע for qames (ֿ).
 נִפְשִׁי Qames (ֿ) under נ for pathah (ֿ).
14. קָמוּ Pathah (ֿ) under ק for qames (ֿ).
 עֲלִי Hatef-pathah (ֿ) under ע for qames (ֿ). Qames (ֿ) under ל for pathah (ֿ).
- וְעֵרַת Qames (ֿ) under ד for pathah (ֿ).
 בִּקְשִׁי Punctuated thus Delitzsch בִּקְשִׁי.
 נִפְשִׁי Qames (ֿ) under נ for pathah (ֿ).
 שְׁמוֹהַ Pathah (ֿ) under שׁ for qames (ֿ).
15. וְאַתָּה Qames (ֿ) under א for pathah (ֿ).
 אֲדָנִי Written "אֲדָנִי".
 רְחוּם Qames (ֿ) under ר for pathah (ֿ).
 וְחֲנוּן Qames (ֿ) under ח for pathah (ֿ).
 אֲפִים Qames (ֿ) under פ for pathah (ֿ).
 וְרַב Qames (ֿ) under ר for pathah (ֿ).
 וְאַמֶּתֶּה Shewa simplex (ֿ) under ו for seghol. Seghol (ֿ) under א for hatef-seghol (ֿ).
16. אֲלִי Seghol (ֿ) under א for sere (ֿ). Qames (ֿ) under ל for pathah (ֿ).
 וְחֲנִנִי Hatef-qames (ֿ) under ח for qames (ֿ).
 עֲזָרָה Seghol (ֿ) under ז for shewa simplex. Dagesh omitted in ז.
 לְעֵבְדָה Hatef-pathah (ֿ) under ע for pathah (ֿ).
 לְבִן Sere (ֿ) under ב for seghol (ֿ).
 אֲמַתָּה Qames (ֿ) under א for hatef-pathah (ֿ).
17. שְׁנָאִי Qames (ֿ) under א for pathah (ֿ); scriptio plena.
 עֲזַרְתִּנִי Qames (ֿ) under ת for pathah (ֿ).

PSALM CXXXII. The MS. gives it קִלָּא.

1. הַמַּעֲלוֹת Qames (ֿ) under מ for pathah (ֿ).

- אֶהְיֶה Seghol (ֿ) under א for sere (ֿ).
 2. אִשְׁרָ Qames (ֿ) under א for hatef-pathah (ֿ).
 נִשְׁבַּע Qames (ֿ) under ב for pathah (ֿ).
 3. אֶבֶא Pathah (ֿ) under א for qames (ֿ).
 אֶעֱלֶה Seghol (ֿ) under ע for hatef-seghol (ֿ).
 עֲלֵי Hatef-pathah (ֿ) under ע for pathah (ֿ).
 יִצְעִי Pathah (ֿ) under ע for qames (ֿ).
 4. אֶתֵּן Sere (ֿ) under א for seghol (ֿ). Seghol (ֿ) under ת for sere (ֿ).
 לַעֲפַעֲפִי There is a ו before ל which was afterwards stricken out. Qames (ֿ) under פ for pathah (ֿ).
 5. עֲרֵי Hatef-pathah (ֿ) under ע for pathah (ֿ).
 לֶאֱבִיר Qames (ֿ) under ל for pathah (ֿ).
 6. הִנֵּה Seghol (ֿ) under נ for sere (ֿ).
 שִׁמְעֵנוּהָ Qames (ֿ) under מ for pathah (ֿ). Shewa simplex (ֿ) under ע for hatef-pathah (ֿ). Pathah (ֿ) under ה for qames (ֿ).
 בְּאֶפְרַתָּה Pathah (ֿ) under פ for qames (ֿ).
 יֵעַר Hatef-pathah (ֿ) under ע for pathah (ֿ).
 7. נִבְּוָה Pathah (ֿ) under נ for qames (ֿ).
 נִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה Qames (ֿ) under ת for pathah (ֿ).
 לְהָרִם Scriptio plena.
 רִנְלִי Qames (ֿ) under ר for pathah (ֿ).
 8. לְמִנוּחָהָ֫דֶּה Hatef-pathah (ֿ) under ה for qames (ֿ). Scriptio plena.
 9. כְּהִנֵּי־ Shewa simplex (ֿ) under כ for qames (ֿ).
 10. עֲבָדָה Hatef-pathah (ֿ) under ע for pathah (ֿ).
 אֶל Qames (ֿ) under א for pathah (ֿ).
 11. נִשְׁבַּע Qames (ֿ) under ב for pathah (ֿ).
 אֶמֶת Seghol (ֿ) under א for hatef-seghol (ֿ).
 יִשׁוּב Pathah (ֿ) under י for Qames (ֿ).
 בְּטִנָּה Seghol (ֿ) under נ for shewa simplex (ֿ).
 לְכֶסֶּף Seghol (ֿ) under כ for sere (ֿ).
 12. וְעֵדָתִי Scriptio plena.
 אֶלְמָדָם Qames (ֿ) under ל for pathah (ֿ). Seghol (ֿ) under ר for sere (ֿ).

- גַּם Qames (ֿ) under ג for pathah (ֿ).
 בְּנֵיהֶם Sere (ֿ) under ב for shewa simplex (ֿ). Seghol (ֿ) under
 ג for sere (ֿ).
 עֲרִי Pathah (ֿ) under ע for hatef-pathah (ֿ).
 עַר Hatef-pathah (ֿ) under ע for pathah (ֿ).
 14. מְנוּחָתִי Hatef-pathah (ֿ) under ח for qames (ֿ).
 עֲרִי Pathah (ֿ) under ע for hatef-pathah (ֿ).
 עַר Hatef-pathah (ֿ) under ע for pathah (ֿ).
 אֲשֶׁב Seghol (ֿ) under ש for sere (ֿ).
 15. צִירָה Scriptio defectiva.
 אֲבָרָךְ Qames (ֿ) under א for hatef-pathah (ֿ). Pathah (ֿ) under
 ב for qames (ֿ).
 וְחִסְדֶּיהָ Pathah (ֿ) under ה for qames (ֿ).
 יִרְנֶנּוּ Qames (ֿ) under ר for pathah (ֿ).
 אֲצַמִּיחַ Qames (ֿ) under ח for pathah (ֿ).

PSALM XLVI. מו

1. לִמְנִצַּח Qames (ֿ) under נ for pathah (ֿ). Dagesh wanting in צ.
 קָרַח Qames (ֿ) under ר for pathah (ֿ).
 עַל Hatef-pathah (ֿ) under ע for pathah (ֿ).
 2. אֱלֹהִים Seghol (ֿ) under א for hatef-seghol (ֿ).
 מַחֲסֶה Qames (ֿ) under מ for pathah (ֿ). Shewa simplex (ֿ) under
 ח for hatef-pathah (ֿ).
 וְעִזַּי Scriptio plena.
 3. עַל Hatef-pathah (ֿ) under ע for pathah (ֿ).
 4. יַחֲמְרוּ Pathah (ֿ) under ח for seghol (ֿ).
 בְּנִאוֹתָיו Qames (ֿ) under נ for pathah (ֿ). Pathah (ֿ) under א for
 hatef-pathah (ֿ).
 5. נָהַר Pathah (ֿ) under ה for qames (ֿ).
 פִּלְגֵּיו Pathah (ֿ) under ג for qames (ֿ).
 יִשְׁמְחוּ Qames (ֿ) under ש for pathah (ֿ).
 קָדַשׁ Qames (ֿ) under ק for shewa simplex (ֿ). Scriptio plena.
 6. בַּל Qames (ֿ) under ב for pathah (ֿ).
 יַעֲזֹרָה Hatef-pathah (ֿ) under ע for shewa simplex (ֿ). Pathah (ֿ)
 under ה for qames (ֿ).

- | | | |
|-----|---------------|---|
| | אלהים | Seghol under א for hatef-seghol (ֿֿ). |
| 7. | מַלְכוֹת | Qames (ֿֿ) under מ for pathah (ֿ). |
| | תְּמוּנָה | Pathah (ֿ) under ת for (ֿֿ). |
| | אֶרֶץ | Our MS. reads הָאֶרֶץ. |
| 8. | מִשְׁנֵבֶה | Qames (ֿֿ) under ג for pathah (ֿ). |
| 9. | | The word יהוה has been added after אלהים. |
| | אִשְׁרָאֵל | Qames (ֿֿ) under א for hatef-pathah (ֿֿֿ). |
| 10. | מַלְחָמוֹת | Hatef-pathah under ח for qames (ֿֿֿ). |
| | עֵדֶיךָ | Hatef-pathah (ֿֿֿ) under ע for pathah (ֿ). |
| | קִצְהָאֶרֶץ | Seghol (ֿֿֿ) under צ for sere (ֿֿֿ). |
| | הָאֶרֶץ | Pathah (ֿֿ) under ה for qames (ֿֿֿ). |
| | יִשְׁבֵּר | Qames (ֿֿ) under ש for pathah (ֿ). |
| | יִקְצֶזְךָ | Seghol (ֿֿֿ) under צ for sere (ֿֿֿ). |
| | חֲנִית | Qames (ֿֿ) under ח for hatef-pathah (ֿֿֿ). |
| | עֲנֹלוֹת | Qames (ֿֿ) under ע for hatef-pathah (ֿֿֿ). |
| | בְּאִשְׁרָאֵל | Pathah (ֿֿ) under ב for qames (ֿֿֿ). Seghol (ֿֿֿ) under א for sere (ֿֿֿ). |
| 11. | אֲנֹכִי | Hatef-pathah (ֿֿֿ) under א for qames (ֿֿֿ). |
| | בְּאֶרֶץ | Pathah (ֿֿ) under ב for qames (ֿֿֿ). |
| 12. | מִשְׁנֵבֶה | Qames (ֿֿ) under ג for pathah (ֿ). |
| | יַעֲקֹב | Qames (ֿֿ) under י for pathah (ֿ). |

PSALM LI. 81

1. **לִמְנַחֲ** Qames (ֿ) under נ for pathah (ֿ).
2. **בְּבוֹא** Scriptio defectiva.
אֱלֹו Seghol (ֿֿ) under א for sere (ֿֿ).
בֹּא Pathah (ֿ) under ב for qames (ֿ).
בַּת Qames (ֿ) under ב for pathah (ֿ).
שִׁבְעַ Qames (ֿ) under ב for pathah (ֿ).
3. **חֲנִי** Hatef-qames (ֿֿ) under ח for qames (ֿ). Seghol (ֿֿ) under נ
for sere (ֿֿ).
אֱלֹהִים Seghol (ֿֿ) under א for hatef-seghol (ֿֿֿ).
בְּחִסְדָּךְ Shewa simplex (ֿ) under ר for seghol (ֿֿ).
כָּרַב Scriptio plena.
פִּשְׁעִי Pathah (ֿ) under ע for qames (ֿ).
4. **הַרְבֵּה** The ה יתיר is not found in the MS.

- טהרני Games (ֿ) under ט for pathah (ֿ). Pathah (ֿ) under ה for hatef-pathah (ֿ).
6. לבדך Seghol (ֿ) under ר for shewa simplex (ֿ).
 חטאתי Pathah (ֿ) under ט for games (ֿ).
 והרע Pathah (ֿ) under ה for games (ֿ). Games (ֿ) under ר for pathah (ֿ).
- בעיניך Sere (ֿ) under נ for seghol (ֿ).
 עשיתי Hatef-pathah (ֿ) under ש for hireq.
 למען Games (ֿ) under both מ and ע for pathah (ֿ).
 תצדק Games (ֿ) under ר for pathah (ֿ).
 ברכרך Hatef-games (ֿ) under ר for games (ֿ).
 בשפטך Hatef-games (ֿ) under ש for games (ֿ).
7. בעיון Pathah (ֿ) under ב for shewa simplex (ֿ). Hatef-pathah (ֿ) under ע for games (ֿ). Scriptio defectiva.
- יחמתי Seghol (ֿ) under ח for hatef-seghol (ֿ). Games (ֿ) under מ for pathah (ֿ).
8. אמת Seghol (ֿ) under א for hatef-seghol (ֿ).
 בטחות Scriptio defectiva.
 ובסתם Shureq (ֿ) with ת for qibbus (ֿ).
 חכמה Hatef-games (ֿ) under ח for games (ֿ).
9. תחטאני Seghol (ֿ) under א for sere (ֿ).
 באזוב Seghol (ֿ) under א for sere (ֿ).
 תכבסני Games (ֿ) under כ for pathah (ֿ).
 אלבין Games (ֿ) under א for pathah (ֿ).
10. תשמיעני Seghol (ֿ) under ע for sere (ֿ).
 תגלנה Pathah (ֿ) under ת for games (ֿ).
 דבית Pathah (ֿ) under ת for games (ֿ).

[In order to save space, the remaining variations of the MS. under consideration, are placed in tabular form.—Ed.]

11.	מחטאי	מחטאי	תקח	תקח
	עונתי	עונתי	השיבה	השיבה
	מחה	מחה	אלמדה	אלמדה
12.	חדש	חדש	פושעים	פושעים
13.	אל	אל	דרכיך	דרכיך
	קדשך	קדשך	אליך	אליך
	אל	אל	ישובי	ישובי

16.	וַאֲתָנָה	וַאֲתָנָה	אֱלֹהִים	אֱלֹהִים
	אֱלֹהִים	אֱלֹהִים	אֱלֹהִי	אֱלֹהִי
	תַּחֲפוֹן	תַּחֲפוֹן	תְּשׁוּעָתִי	תְּשׁוּעָתִי
17.	אֲזִי	אֲזִי	אֲדָנִי	אֲדָנִי
	עַל	עַל	שִׁפְתִּי	שִׁפְתִּי
18.	מִזְבֵּחַךְ	מִזְבֵּחַךְ	תַּחֲפוֹן	תַּחֲפוֹן
			זִבַּח	זִבַּח

PSALM LXXXV. פה.

1.	תִּתֵּן	תִּתֵּן	לִמְנַצֵּחַ	לִמְנַצֵּחַ
2.	לָנוּ	לָנוּ	אֶרְצֶךָ	אֶרְצֶךָ
	אֲשַׁמְעָה	אֲשַׁמְעָה	שַׁבָּת	שַׁבָּת
	מָה	מָה	שְׁבוּת (keri)	שְׁבוּת
3.	הָאֵל	הָאֵל	עַמֶּךָ	עַמֶּךָ
4.	חֲסִידָיו	חֲסִידָיו	אֶסְפֹּת	אֶסְפֹּת
	יִשׁוּבוּ	יִשׁוּבוּ	הַשִּׁיבוּת	הַשִּׁיבוּת
5.	לִידָאִיו	לִידָאִיו	וְהִפְרֹ	וְהִפְרֹ
6.	לִשְׁכֹּן	לִשְׁכֹּן	הַלְעוֹלָם	הַלְעוֹלָם
	וְאֵמֶת	וְאֵמֶת	תֹּאנֶף	תֹּאנֶף
	וְשָׁלוֹם	וְשָׁלוֹם	תִּמְשֹׁךְ	תִּמְשֹׁךְ
	נִשְׁקוּ	נִשְׁקוּ	אֶפֶךָ	אֶפֶךָ
	אֵמֶת	אֵמֶת	לָדָר	לָדָר
	נִשְׁקָף	נִשְׁקָף	וְדָר	וְדָר
7.	וְאַרְצָנוּ	וְאַרְצָנוּ	הָלֹא	הָלֹא
	וַיֵּשֶׁם	וַיֵּשֶׁם	הַשּׁוֹב	הַשּׁוֹב
8.	לְדֶרֶךְ	לְדֶרֶךְ	תַּחֲנוּנוֹ	תַּחֲנוּנוֹ
	פַּעַמָּיו	פַּעַמָּיו	וַיִּשְׁעֶךָ	וַיִּשְׁעֶךָ

PSALM CVIII. קח

2.	בְּעַמִּים	בְּעַמִּים	אֲשִׁירָה	אֲשִׁירָה
	מֵעַל	מֵעַל	אֶף	אֶף
3.	שָׁמַיִם	שָׁמַיִם	עוֹרָה	עוֹרָה
	חֲסִדֶּךָ	חֲסִדֶּךָ	הַגָּבֹל	הַגָּבֹל
	וְעַד	וְעַד	אֲעִירָה	אֲעִירָה
	שְׁחָקִים	שְׁחָקִים	שָׁחַר	שָׁחַר

	אֶמְתָּךְ	וּאֶפְרַיִם	וּאֶפְרַיִם
6.	עַל	מַחֲקִקִי	מַחֲקִקִי
	שָׁמַיִם	רַחֲצִי	רַחֲצִי
	וְעַל	עַל	עַל
	הָאָרֶץ	אֲדוֹם	אֲדוֹם
7.	לְמַעַן	אֶתְרוּעַע	אֶתְרוּעַע
	יַחֲלִצוּן	יֹבִילִנִי	יֹבִילִנִי
	וְעַנְנִי	עַד	עַד
8.	דְּבַר	אֲדוֹם	אֲדוֹם
	בִּקְדֹשׁוֹ	הָלֹא	הָלֹא
	אֶעֱלֶזָּה	תִּצָּא	תִּצָּא
	אֶחֱלֶקָה	בְּצַבְאוֹתֵינוּ	בְּצַבְאוֹתֵינוּ
	וְעִמָּךְ	הִבֵּה	הִבֵּה
	סִבּוֹת	וְשׂוֹא	וְשׂוֹא
	אֶמְדַּר	בְּאַלְהִים	בְּאַלְהִים
9.	לִי	חֵיל	חֵיל
	מִנְשָׂה	יְבוֹם	יְבוֹם

PSALM XIII. יג

2.	עַד	אֵיבִי	אֵיבִי
	פָּנִיךָ	יִכְלֹתִיו	יִכְלֹתִיו
	מִמֶּנִּי	צָרִי	צָרִי
4.	עֵינִי	וְאֲנִי	וְאֲנִי
	אִישָׁן	יָגַל	יָגַל
5.	יֹאמֶר	גָּמַל	גָּמַל

PSALM CXLII. קמב.

1.	בַּמַּעְרָה	עָלִי	עָלִי
	(Some late erasure has been made in the punctuation of ב and מ, with what object does not appear.)	בְּאוֹרֶחַ	בְּאוֹרֶחַ
		אֶחֱלֶךְ	אֶחֱלֶךְ
3.	אֲשַׁפֹּךְ	הַבֵּיט	הַבֵּט
	צָרָתִי	וּרְאֵה	וּרְאֵה
	לִפְנֵי	מִכִּיר	מִכִּיר
	אֲנִיד	דּוֹרֵשׁ	דּוֹרֵשׁ
4.	בַּחֲתָעֶטֶף	אֶלֶיךָ	אֶלֶיךָ

	החיים	החיים	אִמְצוּ	אִמְצוּ
7.	הקשיבה	הקשיבה	מִמֶּנִּי	מִמֶּנִּי
	דלותי	דלותי	יִכְתִּירוּ	יִכְתִּירוּ
	מרדפי	מרדפי	תִּגְמַל	תִּגְמַל
Here is a note פתח באתנה				

PSALM CXXXVIII. In the MS. it is numbered קלו.

1.	לָדוֹד	לָדוֹד	מִמְּרַחֵק	מִמְּרַחֵק
	אֲזַמְרֵךְ	אֲזַמְרֵךְ	יִדַּע	The MS. contains
2.	אֲשַׁתְּחוּהָ	אֲשַׁתְּחוּהָ	יִרַע	and above י probably for י
	קִדְשֶׁךָ	קִדְשֶׁךָ		as a correction.
	אֲמַתְךָ	אֲמַתְךָ	תַּחֲיִינִי	תַּחֲיִינִי
	כָּל	The Massoret. note	אִיבִי	אִיבִי
	is כ' בחולם	yet we have it	יִדַּח	יִדַּח
	pointed with qames.		7.	יִדַּח
				In place of this word
3.	וְתַעֲנֵנִי	וְתַעֲנֵנִי		the MS. contains וְתִאֲחַזְנֵנִי, the
	תִּרְהַבֵּנִי	תִּרְהַבֵּנִי		other word being given as a var-
	עֵז	עֵז		iant.
5.	וַיִּשְׁירוּ	וַיִּשְׁרוּ	יִמְיִנֶה	יִמְיִנֶה
6.	וַיִּשְׁפַּל	וַיִּשְׁפַּל	יִגְמֹר	יִגְמֹר
	וְגִבָּה	וְגִבָּה	מַעֲשֵׂי	מַעֲשֵׂה
				Writ. inst.

PSALM CXLI. The number קמא is written by another hand.

2.	מִשְׁאֵת	מִשְׁאֵת	וּבֹל	Written וּבֹל
	כְּפִי	כְּפִי	אֶלְחֶם	אֶלְחֶם
	מִנְחַת	מִנְחַת	בְּמִנְעֵמֵיהֶם	בְּמִנְעֵמֵיהֶם
	עֶרֶב	עֶרֶב	צִדִּיק	צִדִּיק
3.	נִצְרָה	נִצְרָה	יָנִי	Written יָנִי
	עַל	עַל	סֹלַע	סֹלַע
	דָּל	דָּל	שׁוֹפְטֵיהֶם	שׁוֹפְטֵיהֶם
	שִׁפְתִּי	שִׁפְתִּי	אֲמַרִי	אֲמַרִי
4.	אֵל	אֵל	פֹּלַח	פֹּלַח
	רַע	רַע	וּבֹקֵעַ	וּבֹקֵעַ
	בְּרָשַׁע	בְּרָשַׁע	בְּאַרְצַ	בְּאַרְצַ
	פֹּעֲלִי	פֹּעֲלִי	עֲצָמֵינוּ	עֲצָמֵינוּ

8.	אֱלֹהֶיךָ	אֱלֹהֶיךָ	פֹּעֲלִי	פֹּעֲלִי
	יְהוָה	אֱלֹהִים	בְּמִכְמָרִי	בְּמִכְמָרִי
	עֵינִי	עֵינִי	יָחַד	יָחַד
	נַפְשִׁי	נַפְשִׁי	אֲנֹכִי	אֲנֹכִי
9.	שָׁמְרֵנִי	שָׁמְרֵנִי	עַד	Omitted in text
	פָּח	פָּח	and added above the line.	
	וּמִקְשׁוֹת	וּמִקְשׁוֹת	אֶעְבּוֹר	אֶעְבּוֹר

PSALM XXVIII. כח.

1.	אֱלֹהֶיךָ	אֱלֹהֶיךָ	הִשָּׁב	הִשָּׁב
	תַּחֲרֹשׁ	תַּחֲרֹשׁ	לָהֶם	לָהֶם
	תַּחֲשָׁה	תַּחֲשָׁה	יְבִינוּ	יְבִינוּ
	וְנִמְשַׁלְתִּי	וְנִמְשַׁלְתִּי	פַּעֲלֹת	פַּעֲלֹת
2.	תַּחֲנוּנִי	תַּחֲנוּנִי	מַעֲשֵׂה	מַעֲשֵׂה
	אֱלֹהֶיךָ	אֱלֹהֶיךָ	יָדָיו	יָדָיו
	בְּנִשְׁאִי	בְּנִשְׁאִי	יִהְרָסֶם	יִהְרָסֶם
	יָדִי	יָדִי	תַּחֲנוּנִי	תַּחֲנוּנִי
	קִדְשֶׁךָ	קִדְשֶׁךָ	עֲזִי	עֲזִי
3.	אֵל	אֵל	וּמִעֲזִי	In our MS.
	וְעַם פֹּעֲלִי אֲנִי דַבְּרִי שְׁלוֹמִים עִם	וְעַם פֹּעֲלִי אֲנִי דַבְּרִי שְׁלוֹמִים עִם	וְנִעְזְרֹתִי	וְנִעְזְרֹתִי
	וְעֵהֶם. This sentence is not in	וְעֵהֶם. This sentence is not in	וְיִעֲלֹז	וְיִעֲלֹז
	the text but is added in the mar-	the text but is added in the mar-	עֲזִי	עֲזִי
	gin in Rabbinical characters.	gin in Rabbinical characters.	לָנוּ	In our MS.
	וְרַעְיָה	וְרַעְיָה	הוֹשִׁיעָה	הוֹשִׁיעָה
	בְּלִבָּכֶם	בְּלִבָּכֶם	וּבִרְךָ	וּבִרְךָ
4.	תֵּן	תֵּן	נַחֲלֶתְךָ	נַחֲלֶתְךָ
	וּכְרֹעַ	וּכְרֹעַ	וְנִשְׁאֵם	וְנִשְׁאֵם
	מִעַלְלֵהֶם	מִעַלְלֵהֶם	עַד	עַד
	כַּמַּעֲשָׂה	כַּמַּעֲשָׂה	הָעוֹלָם	הָעוֹלָם
	לָהֶם	לָהֶם		

PSALM XXXII. לב

1.	פִּשַׁע	פִּשַׁע	בִּשְׁאֲגָתִי	בִּשְׁאֲגָתִי
	חַטָּאה	חַטָּאה	יוֹמָם	יוֹמָם
2.	יַחֲשָׁב	יַחֲשָׁב	וּלְיָלָה	וּלְיָלָה

	עֲלִי	עֲלִי	לַעֲת	לַעֲת
	יִרְךָ	יִרְךָ	מִצֵּא	מִצֵּא
	קִיִּין	קִיִּין	לִשְׁטָף	לִשְׁטָף
5.	וְעֹנִי	וְעֹנִי	מִים	מִים
	עֲלִי	עֲלִי	רַבִּים	רַבִּים
	פִּשְׁעִי	פִּשְׁעִי	יִגְיֵעוּ	יִגְיֵעוּ
	חֲטָאתִי	חֲטָאתִי	7. אֶתָּה	אֶתָּה
6.	יִתְפַּלֵּל	יִתְפַּלֵּל	סִתָּר	סִתָּר
	אֱלֹהֶיךָ	אֱלֹהֶיךָ	מִצָּר	מִצָּר

The last page of the MS. is so blurred that it was impossible to continue the notes to this Psalm.

TABULAR VIEW.

	$\frac{1}{\tau}$		$\frac{1}{\tau}$		$\frac{1}{\tau}$		$\frac{1}{\tau}$				
	for $\frac{1}{\tau}$	141		for $\frac{1}{\tau}$	13		for $\frac{1}{\tau}$	90			
	$\frac{1}{\tau}$	13		$\frac{1}{\tau}$	2		$\frac{1}{\tau}$	24			
	$\frac{1}{\tau}$	2									
	$\frac{1}{\tau}$		$\frac{1}{\tau}$		$\frac{1}{\tau}$		$\frac{1}{\tau}$				
for	$\frac{1}{\tau}$	13	for	$\frac{1}{\tau}$	26	for	$\frac{1}{\tau}$	47	for	$\frac{1}{\tau}$	3
	$\frac{1}{\tau}$	36					$\frac{1}{\tau}$	23		$\frac{1}{\tau}$	6
							$\frac{1}{\tau}$	9		$\frac{1}{\tau}$	3

There are eighteen differences occurring once each.

Scriptiones plenæ, 56

Scriptiones defectivæ, 8

מִשְׁרָתִים—מַלְכִים

A CONTRIBUTION TO THE HISTORY OF THE TERMINOLOGY OF HEBREW GRAMMAR-

BY PROFESSOR DR. WILHELM BACHER,

Budapest, Hungaria.

In the May number of *HEBRAICA* (p. 64) Dr. Felsenthal says of the oldest ante-Qimḥi grammarians: "They called them the seven kings (מַלְכִים), and the sh'wâ they called the servant (מִשְׁרָת)." This remark is based upon the common view that the appellation "kings" for vowels was used by the ancient Hebrew grammarians to mark the contrast with the "serving" sh'wâ. That this view is erroneous I have already shown in my work *Abraham Ibn Ezra als Grammatiker*, (Strassburg i. E., 1882) p. 61, Anm. 1. What I have stated there I will briefly repeat here and supplement this with some further considerations.

Already Ben Asher calls the vowels מַלְכִים, cf. Digdugê ha-t'amim, ed. Baer and Strack, § 10: "והם שבעה מַלְכִים בְּכ"ב מומלכים," "they (the vowels) are the seven kings, appointed as rulers over the twenty-two consonants." They are accordingly called "kings," because they are the lords of the consonants and the sounds giving them motion. M'naḥem b. Sarug, in the same sense, though not using the expression מַלְכִים, says: ותכון המלה תחת ממשלתם והמה, מושליה ואוחזיה, "the word is confirmed under their government, and they are its rulers and possessors." (Maḥbereth ed. Filipowski, p. 4a). According to M'naḥem then, the vowels are the rulers of the word; they determine its pronunciation and meaning; but at another place (l. c. p. 7b) he calls them "those set over the letters and their rulers: אלה האותיות . . . יש שוטרים עליהם. ומושלים אותם." The same thing, although from another point of view, we find also in Dunash ben Labrât the opponent of M'naḥem, who in his anti-critique of the latter calls the vowels "the seven fathers of speech"—אבות המבטא שבעה (criticae vocum recensione, p. 5). In Jehuda Hayyug, the founder of the new science of Hebrew grammar, there appears in the midst of the Arabic text the traditional Hebrew term שבעה מַלְכִים (cf. my work über die grammatische Terminologie des . . . Hajjug [Wien, 1882], p. 18; also Derenbourg, Opusculs et Traité d'Abou'l Walid, p. 274). But neither in him nor in Ibn Ġanâḥ is there the least indication that sh'wâ is considered as "serving" and the vowels, over against the sh'wâ, as "rulers." The contrast between מַלְכִים and מִשְׁרָתִים is known to the old grammarians in reference to the root-letters and function-letters. The former are called מַלְכִים, the latter מִשְׁרָתִים by Dunash ben Labrât, l. c. p. 5b, as also by his pupil Jehudî ben Shesheth, in his criticism of M'naḥem's pupils (Liber Responsiorum, ed. Stern, p. 28, l. 22) cf. Die grammatische Terminologie etc., p. 25, Anm. 2.

Joseph Qimḥi with whom a new theory of Hebrew vowels begins to assert itself, namely the division into five long and five short vowels, cannot emancipate himself entirely from the old terminology. His definition of sh'wâ begins with the following words: "Know that the sh'wâ is not a vowel by itself, and that it has not been made a ruler among the seven kings, for the glory of kingship was not bestowed upon it (דע כי השבא אינה תנועה בפני עצמה ולא המליכוה) (בשבעה מַלְכִים כי לא נתן עליה הוד מלכות). I quote this passage from

the ספר הזכרון, from the manuscript copy kindly put at my disposal by Mr. S. J. Halberstam.

The sh'wâ then is for him also not yet a "servant" of the vowels; it is only not a king like them, simply because it is not a vowel. In Moses Qimḥi's short handbook מהלך שבילי הדעת no definition of the sh'wâ is found. David Qimḥi, however, says in his מכלול, in the beginning of the section on the sh'wâ (ed. Lyck, fol. 138 b; ed. Fürth, fol. 154 b), but without any reference to the term מלכים, "The sh'wâ is not a vowel, but serves the vowels." (השוא איננה תנועה אך היא משרתת התנועות). With this the term "servant" came to be used for the sh'wâ in the same degree as Qimḥi exerted an influence on the later grammarians. Benjamin ben Jehudâ, of Rome, who lived at the close of the thirteenth and the beginning of the fourteenth centuries, says concerning the sh'wâ in his little work, which is often printed as an introduction to Moses Qimḥi's grammar (cf. the collection of דקדוקים, edited by Elia Levita, in Bomberg's printing officin, Venice, 1546): ואינה בעצמה תנועה רק היא משרתת: "ואינה בעצמה תנועה" (probably משרתת is to be read as feminine, as in 1 Kgs. i., 15, or to be emended into משרתת). Two hundred years later, Elia Levita, next to the Qimḥi's the most influential grammarian, transferred the name of "kings," which formerly was the designation of the seven vowels in the old system, to the ten vowels of the new system, and he says in his grammar (which is partly metrical) פרקי אליה (in the collection of דקדוקים mentioned above) p. 55, b.

המולכים בהברה
קטן לגדול כשורה
ושמו שוא ולכך נברא

אלה מלכים העשרה
חמש משרתות לחמש
אחר משרת לכלם

That is, of the ten kings, the five short ones serve the five long ones; but all are served by the sh'wâ set apart for this purpose. P. 58 a, of the same book we read of the sh'wâ: אשר נקרא משרת למלכים.

We will refer here only to Abraham Balmes, who in מקנה אברהם (Venice, 1523) introduces section three (שער הנקודות), with a long explanation of the division of the vowels into מלכים and עבדים. Also Prophiat Duran (Efodi) may be referred to, who ascribes the use of the word מלכים for the seven vowels to Ibn Ezra (Ma'sé Efod, ed. Friedländer and Kohn, (Wien, 1865) p. 34, וכבר הניחו אותם מפני זה קצת החכמים שבעה וקרא אותם האבן (עזרא מלכים להתנהג תנועת הסימנים על פיהם אותיות = סימנים), but he still has the correct idea that the vowels are called kings "because the letters (קולות) are governed by their command," i. e., just as Ben Asher expressed it, because the vowels govern the consonant signs.

I will improve this opportunity to refer also to an appellation of the seven vowels which is found in the Arabic commentary of Saadya on the book Jetsira, quoted in Derenbourg's Manuel du Lecteur, p. 207. אלסבע נגמאת, the seven sounds. נגמה = Heb. נעימה has in other connections a musical meaning.

THE ARAMAIC LANGUAGE.

BY PROF. E. KAUTZSCH, D. D.,

Tuebingen, Germany.

TRANSLATED FROM KAUTZSCH'S GRAMMATIK DES BIBLISCH-ARAMÄISCHEN.

By Professor Charles R. Brown, Newton Centre, Mass.

§ 1. THE RELATION OF BIBLICAL ARAMAIC TO THE REMAINING SEMITIC LANGUAGES.

The Aramaic dialect occurring in a few sections of the Old Testament (Dan. II., 4b—VII., 28; Ezra IV., 8—VI., 18; VII., 12—26; Jer. X., 11, as well as in two words of Gen. XXXI., 47) is a member of the West-Aramaic group of dialects. The latter, together with the closely related East-Aramaic group, forms the Aramaic branch of the Shemitic, or more narrowly, of the North-Shemitic family of languages.

Concerning the ramification of the Shemitic family generally, cf.: *E. Renan*, *histoire générale des langues sémitiques*. 4. ed. Paris 1864; *Gesenius-Kautzsch*, *hebr. Grammatik* §§ 1, 2, and the literature there under § 1. No. 6; *B. Stade*, *Lehrbuch der hebr. Gramm.*, Leipzig 1879, §§ 2—11 (with searching consideration of the later literature); *E. König*, *histor.-krit. Lehrgebäude d. hebr. Sprache*, Leipzig 1881, § 3. Concerning the Aramaic in particular: *Th. Nöldeke*, "Aram" in *Schenkel's Bibellexicon* I, 229 sq., as well as in the "Ausland," for 1867, p. 778 sq. ("Namen und Wohnsitze der Aramäer") and in *Ztschr. der deutschen morgenl. Gesellschaft*, Vol. XXV. (1871), p. 113 sq. ("Die Namen der aram. Nation und Sprache"); *Schrader*, "Aram" in *Riehm's Hdwörterb. des Bibl. Alterthums*, p. 79 sq.; *Volck*, "Aram" in *Herzog-Plitt's Protestant. Realencyklopädie*, 2. ed., I, 601 sq. (with copious references to the literature); *H. Strack*, *Einleitung ins A. Test.*, in *Zöckler's Handb. der theolog. Wissenschaften* I, 191 sq. (Add to these: *David*, *grammaire de la langue araméenne* [in the Syriac language], Paris 1880; *R. Duval*, *traité de grammaire syriaque*. Paris 1881).

The above definition presupposes a division of the Shemitic dialects into (1) the Arabic-Ethiopic branch, as the South-Shemitic, as distinguished from (2) the North-Shemitic, including the other three chief-branches of the Shemitic family (the Canaanitic, the Aramaic and the Assyrian-Babylonian).

§ 2. GRADUAL EXTENSION OF THE WEST-ARAMAIC DIALECT.

The home of the West-Aramaic dialect was the territory between the upper Euphrates and the Mediterranean Sea (with the exception of course of the Phœnician coast-line). This territory includes the regions South and South-West of Damascus, extending, therefore, as far as the boundaries of the kingdom of Israel (cf. 1 Sam. X., 6, concerning the conflict of David with the Aramæans of Beth-rehob, who, according to Judg. XVIII., 28, lived in the immediate neighborhood of Dan). In earlier times, however, the Aramaic began to advance further South and to dispossess the Canaanitic dialects (including Hebrew) until finally—about the middle of the second century B. C.—it became the common language of the country in Syria, Palestine and the adjacent countries on the East.

Detached points of contact with the Aramaic, not all borrowed directly therefrom, however, can be established even in pre-exilic books of the Old Testament composed on the soil of the Northern kingdom, certainly, e. g., in the Song of Solomon and in certain parts of Judges. A direct influence of Aramaic was doubtless opened by the deportations of Israelites spoken of in 2 Kgs. xv., 29 and xvii., 6 (734 and 722 B. C.); for after that, according to 2 Kgs. xvii., 24, (cf. also Ezra IV., 2, 10) the thoroughly depopulated land was occupied by colonists who had come in part from territory where Aramaic was spoken (e. g. Hamath).

In Judah, as far as we can judge, the written language was maintained, almost without Aramaic influence, until the close of the seventh century. It is shown by 2 Kgs. XVIII., 26, however (cf. Isa. XXXVI., 11), that toward the end of the eighth century (the occurrence relating thereto falls in the year 701) Aramaic was understood, at least by the principal men in Judah, and, consequently, already was a language of international trade, or, at any rate, of diplomacy. This fact is confirmed in the Aramaic legends which have been preserved (beside an Assyrian text) on tablets of clay, as well as on fragments from the ruins of Assyrian and Babylonian palaces (afterwards, also, on old Persian coins); cf. *Schrader*, ZDMG, 1872, p. 167, and the literature there; further, *Levy*, Gesch. der jüd. Münzen, Lpz., 1862, p. 147, sq.; *de Vogue*, Mélanges d'archéologie orientale, Paris, 1868, p. 193, sq.¹ The first direct influence of Aramaic on the Hebrew is to be found in Jeremiah² (cf. *Zimmer*, Aramaïsme Jeremiani I, Halle, 1880), more certainly, and already of a grammatical sort, in Ezekiel; while the writers of the last part of the Exile (Isa. XIII., sq., XXXIV., XXXV., XL.—LXVI.) and shortly after the same (Haggai, Zechariah, and even Malachi and the memoirs of Nehemiah worked into the book of Nehemiah) are distinguished by a comparatively pure Hebrew. In the exilic and post-exilic parts of the Pentateuch and of Joshua, which formerly were designated as the Original Writing, or Elder Elohist (now as the Priests' Codex, or Q) the influence of Aramaic is shown more in the domain of lexicon than of grammar (cf. concerning this especially *Riehm*, in the Theolog. Studien u. Kritiken, 1872, p. 283, sq., and *V. Ryssel*, de Elohistæ Pentateuchici Sermone, Lpz., 1878, both holding fast to the pre-exilic composition of the Priest's Codex, though *Ryssel* especially, by his careful and profound investigations, has produced much evidence for the opposite view); *Giesebrecht* opposes *Ryssel* ("Zur Hexateuchkritik," in the Ztschr. f. die Alttest. Wissensch., 1881, p. 177, sq.) and his conclusions are modified again, in some particulars, by *Driver*, "On Some Alleged Linguistic Affinities of the Elohist" (in the Journal of Philology, Oct., 1882, p. 201, sq.). Still stronger is the Aramaic coloring in several post-exilic books; in particular, Chronicles, Esther and, to the most marked degree, in Koheleth and certain Psalms (cf. for Koheleth the commentaries of *Franz Delitzsch*, Lpz., 1875, p. 197, sq. and *C. H. Wright*, The Book of Koheleth, London, 1883, p. 488, sq.; concerning Books II.—V. of the Psalms, cf. *Giesebrecht*, "Ueber die Abfassungszeit der Psalmen," in Ztschr. f. die Alttest. Wissensch., 1881, p. 276, sq.).

§ 3. CONTEMPORANEOUS USE OF ARAMAIC AND HEBREW.

It is presupposed by documents in Ezra (IV., 8–22; V., 6–17; VI., 6–12; VII., 11–26) that, under the Persian supremacy, Aramaic was used in diplomatic intercourse with Western Asia. The fact, however, that the author of the present book of Ezra (toward the end of the fourth century B. C.), after giving the Aramaic documents (IV., 8, sq.), carries on his own narrative in Aramaic, and that the author of Daniel (about 167 B. C.), after the conversation between Nebuchadnezzar and the Chaldeans (II., 4–11), continues, up to the end of chapter

¹ Of course we must not conclude from these Assy. Baby. parallels, with *v. Gutschmid* (Neue Beiträge zur Gesch. des alten Orients, Leipzig, 1876, p. 18, sq.) that the business world in Nineveh then spoke Aramaic and no longer understood the official [Assyrian] language. (As it is said to follow also, according to *v. Gutschmid*, from 2 Kgs. XVIII., 26, that a dialect of the Aramaic was the popular language in the territory of the Euphrates and the Tigris already in the eighth century). For the contrary cf. *Schrader*, Keilinschriften und Geschichtsforschung (Giessen, 1878), p. 62 sq.—Least of all may we conclude from the above facts that the Aramaic idiom naturalized in Palestine in the last centuries B. C. could only have been imported from Babylonia; cf. concerning that below § 6, 2.

² In this statement, we designedly leave out of consideration the Book of Job, as linguistically peculiar; besides unquestionable Aramaisms (such as the frequent מְלִיץ and מְלִים instead of the Hebrew דִּבְרָרִים) the book contains no less frequent points of contact with the Arabic store of words.

vii., in Aramaic, satisfactorily show that, at that time, both writers and readers must have been equally familiar with both dialects.

The above conclusion would still remain valid, if we had presupposed, with *Strack* (Einleitung ins A. T., p. 165), that, at least after Alexander the Great, there was an Aramaic book of the narratives of Daniel, which, at the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, was interwoven with the recently written book of visions. Similarly affirms *v. Orelli*, *die Alttest. Weissagung von der Vollendung des Gottesreiches* (Wien, 1882), p. 515, sq. On the contrary, *Merx* ("Cur in libro Danielis juxta Hebræam Aramæa adhibita sit dialectus?" Hal., 1865) explains the occurrence of two languages in the book on the assumption that the Aramaic text was for the people, and the Hebrew for the learned men. In that case, however, the same would have to be affirmed of Ezra, which, in regard to the Hebrew chapters in that book, is impossible.—We here mention, further, the ingenious fancy which the so-called *Græcus Venetus* (ed. by *O. Gebhardt*, Lpz., 1875) realized in his translation of Daniel, by rendering the Hebrew parts into Attic, and the Aramaic into the Doric dialect.

§ 4. HEBREW SUPPLANTED, AS A LANGUAGE OF INTERCOURSE, BY ARAMAIC.

The actual dispossession of Hebrew, as the language of conversation, by Aramaic, must be dated from the end of the third century B. C.; previous to that an influence had been exerted, through the government of the Ptolemies and of the first Seleucidæ, in favor of Greek rather than Aramaic. For a time, two languages may have had sway, even in ordinary intercourse, as they do to-day upon the border of territories where different languages are spoken, until finally Hebrew was preserved only as the language of the schools, and, at last—perhaps after the last pre-Christian century—only as the language of worship. As late as the first century A. D., however, Hebrew as such was understood, even by the people, at least in Palestine. This can be proved by such passages as Luke iv., 17 sq.

That acquaintance with Aramaic on the part of the post-exilic colony at Jerusalem must take place, as it were, of itself is shown by a glance at the configuration of its territory. On the North, a population speaking Aramaic extended tolerably near to the gates of Jerusalem; in some places, the new Jewish settlers were evidently entirely surrounded by neighbors speaking Aramaic. Add to this the fact that, for the satisfaction of most their wants, the Jews were dependent upon foreign traders, with whom business could be transacted hardly otherwise than in the common language of the rest of Palestine; cf. Neh. xiii., 16, 20, according to which even Tyrians were then settled in Jerusalem, and other traders from abroad were accustomed to come to the city. That a common familiarity on the part of all the inhabitants of a district where two languages are spoken (even though they be quite different from each other) is possible, may be observed to-day in certain regions of Switzerland, Belgium (especially in Brussels) and elsewhere.

That Hebrew was understood for a long time after the decided victory of the Aramaic as the language of conversation, was due, on the one hand, to the zeal of the learned men and, on the other, to the significance of Hebrew as the sacred language of the entire people. The first is attested by the fact that much which is undeniably old in the language has been handed over to the post-biblical Hebrew. The exclusive use of Hebrew in the reading of the Old Testament is attested by the uniform Jewish tradition that, in the public use of Scripture, the most that was allowed, for a long time, was the oral interpretation of the same into Aramaic. From the latter fact, it might be explained how the hearers gradually became familiar with the Aramaic form of certain parts of the divine Word, as appears to follow from Matt. xxvii., 46 and Mark xv., 34 (cf. also *Reuss Gesch. der hl. Schriften des A. T.*, p. 723); but the demonstrative force of such passages as Luke iv., 17 sq., where there is not the least intimation of an interpretation after

the reading is not thereby annulled.¹ It is true that in the Mishna, the habitual interpretation of what is read appears presupposed, when, in Megilla iv., 4 the reader of the Law is directed to read no more than one verse to the translator, while three are permitted in the prophetic reading (cf. also iv., 6 regarding the reading and interpretation of the Law by minors, and iv., 10 concerning the parts which may be read indeed, but not translated). But it is another question whether this mode of procedure had arisen at the time of Jesus. We might decide certainly, only if we were accurately informed as to the nature of the "verses" (פסוקים) here intended and the date of their introduction. Just as little may we conclude with Zunz (gottesdienstliche Vorträge der Juden, p. 61 sq.) from the existence of a written Targum of Job about the middle of the first century and still older Targums of Esther and the Psalms, all of which are affirmed in the Talmud, that there was already a Targum of the Law on record. Cf. on this subject Bleek-Wellh. Einleitung ins A. Test., p. 606 and the citation there from the Jerusalem Talmud, in which it is forbidden to read the interpretation from a book. Concerning the (infrequent) prayers in the Aramaic language, as e. g. the so-called Qaddiš, originally "Concluding prayer after haggadic discourses in houses of mourning," cf. Delitzsch, Gesch. der jüd. Poesie, p. 136, Note.

§ 5. THE REMAINS OF THE WEST-ARAMAIC DIALECT.

Whether a pagan and profane literature ever existed in the West-Aramaic (or indeed in any Aramaic) language,² must remain undecided. The remains of West-Aramaic yet existing belong chiefly to the domain of Jewish (including Samaritan) religious writings. Here belong:

1. The Aramaic portions of the Old Testament (cf. above § 1 and below § 7).

Whether any one of the so-called Apocryphal books of the Old Testament was composed originally in West-Aramaic, it is entirely impossible to show. Jerome

¹ Compare the very noteworthy treatment of this question by Franz Delitzsch in "The Hebrew New Testament of the British and Foreign Bible Society" (Leipzig, 1883), extracts from which (in Translation [German T.]) might be of interest in regard to other questions. It is said there on pp. 30, 31: "A friend of mine does not cease to entreat me to translate the New Testament into the Aramaic idiom which was spoken in Palestine in the days of Christ and his apostles; that is, into the language of the Palestinian Talmud and the Palestinian Targums. But his desire rests on an illusion. The Hebrew remained even after the Exile the language of Jewish literature. The Ecclesiasticus of Jesus Sirach was written in Hebrew, as its fragments in the Talmud show. The original of the first book of Maccabees and of the so-called Psalter of Solomon was Hebrew. The inscriptions on coins, the epitaphs, the liturgic prayers were Hebrew. The form of the laws was Hebrew, as appears from their codification in the Mishna, also the book, in which, as Papias says, Matthew had collected the sermons of the Lord, was written ἐβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ. It is true, that in that time ἐβραϊστί and χaldaïστί [? cf. concerning this below § 6, 1, Rem.] were not accurately distinguished. Nevertheless it is quite unlikely that Matthew wrote in Aramaic; for the Aramaic dialect of Palestine—which in the Talmud is called סורית....—was the language of daily life, the vulgar language, in which the people and also the learned were wont to converse and to hold controversies, but ἡ ἐβραϊκὴ διάλεκτος, in which St. Paul was accosted by the exalted Savior, Acts xxvi., 14, and in which he himself addressed the people of Jerusalem, Acts xxi., 40; xxii., 2, [cf. below § 6, 3] was the holy language, the language of the temple worship, of synagogical and domestic prayer; of all formulas of benediction, of the traditional law; further, the parables, the animal fables, the lamentations for the dead in the Talmuds and Midrashim are mostly Hebrew; the holy language continued to be the language of the higher form of speech, even the popular proverbs were only partly Aramaic. Josephus stating in the preface of his work on the Jewish war, that his narrative was originally drawn up for his compatriots of inner Asia in the common mother-tongue, certainly means the Hebrew, not the Aramaic language. Knowledge of Hebrew was then, as now, universal among the educated of the nation. Aramaic, on the contrary, was understood only by a small portion of the Diaspora [Dispersion T.].... Therefore it would be a useless attempt to translate the New Testament into the Palestinian Sursi. The Shemitic woof of the New Testament Hellenism is Hebrew, not Aramaic. Our Lord and his apostles thought and spoke [?] for the most part in Hebrew."

² Renan (Histoire generale, p. 259) regards this as at least probable.

(see the proof passages in *E. Schuerer's* article, "Apokryphen des A. Test." in *Herzog's* protest. Real-Encykl. I², p. 491 sq.) names the books of Tobit and Judith as composed Chaldaico sermone (i. e. West Aramaic) and translated them from this idiom into Latin, but that by no means shuts out the conclusion (which in the case of Judith is almost indubitable, cf. *Schuerer* p. 505 and in other places), that the actual original of both texts was Hebrew, the Aramaic text consequently itself a translation. (For the more recent discussions of this controversy, occasioned by *Ad. Neubauer's* issue of an Aramaic text of the book of Tobit from a Bodleian MS., Oxford 1878, see in my report of O. T. studies of 1878 in the "Wissenschaftlichen Jahresbericht der deutschen Morgenländ. Gesellsch." [Leipzig 1881], p. 23; *Graetz* declares himself in favor of a modern Hebrew original of Tobit. See his essays on "The Book of Tobit" etc. in "Monatsschr. für Gesch. u. Wissensch. des Judenth." 1879, p. 145 sq.). Likewise the Aramaic proverbs of Sirach, which have been handed down to us, partly in Talmudic citations and partly as a compilation by themselves (as the so-called "small Sirach" or "Alphabet of the son of Sirach" in connection with an alphabet of the Hebrew proverbs of Sirach) prove nothing against a Hebrew original of the Greek book of Sirach. These proverbs are, rather, in part translations of Hebrew matter, in part independent additions of a later compiler; cf. *Delitzsch*, zur Gesch. der jüd. Poesie (Leipzig 1836, p. 20 sq.), *L. Dukes*, Rabbinische Blumenlese (Leipzig, 1844), p. 31 sq., and especially p. 67 sq. (where may be found more details concerning the literature of these proverbs); according to the text of *Paul Fagius* (Isny, 1542) *Dukes* gives here twenty-three Aramaic proverbs of Sirach (besides forty-two Hebrew ones).

2. Detached Words and Clauses in the New Testament and in the writings of Josephus.

The samples of the language of intercourse in Palestine at the time of Jesus and the apostles, which appear occasionally in the N. T., would of themselves be sufficient to contradict any fables which have arisen concerning the idiom spoken by them. Cf. with regard to this *Reiske*, de lingua vernacula Jesu Christi, Jen. 1670, and particularly *de Rossi*, dissertazioni della lingua propria di Cristo e degli Ebrei nazionali della Palestina da tempi Maccabei in disamina del sentimento di un recente scrittore Italiano, Parma, 1772.¹ By the latter is meant the Neapolitan *Domin. Diodati* and his book de Christo Graece loquente (Neap. 1767). Further: *H. F. Pfannkuche* "Ueber die palästinische Landessprache in dem Zeitalter Christi und der Apostel, ein Versuch, zum Theil nach *de Rossi* entworfen" in *Eichhorn's* Allgem. Bibliothek der bibl. Litter. Vol. VIII. (1798) 3, p. 365 sq. *H. E. G. Paulus*, verosimilia de Judaeis Palaestinsensibus, Jesu etiam atque apostolis, non aramaica dialecto sola, sed graeca quoque aramaica locutis. Jena 1803. *Winer*, Gramm. des neutest. Sprachidioms § 3 (Hebrew-Aramaic coloring of the N. T. diction; with many references to the older literature). *Franz Delitzsch* "Ueber die palästinische Volkssprache, welche Jesus und seine Jünger geredet haben" in the year 1874, No. 27 of the "Daheim" (also in the Zeitschrift "Saar auf Hoffnung" 1874, p. 195 sq.); the same, "Traces of the vernacular tongue in the gospels" in the "Hebrew Student" (Chicago), Nov., 1882, p. 81 sq.; Dec., p. 104 sq.; Sept., 1883, p. 1, sq. Concerning the bad pronunciation of the Galileans indicated in Matt. XXVI., 73, Mark XIV., 70 (Acts II., 7), which appeared especially in the complete ignoring of gutturals, cf. the Talmudic proofs in *Weststein*, Nov. Test., on Matt. XXVI., 73; *Meuschen*, Nov. Test. ex Talmude etc. illustratum (Lipz. 1736) p. 119. The reproach was raised in particular with reference to the Galilean pronunciation of Hebrew.

Below we give an alphabetical list¹ of the samples of Palestinian Aramaic found in the N. T. with the addition of the most important witnesses, namely, the Codex Sinaiticus [S], Alexandrinus [A], Vaticanus [B], Ephraeme Syri [C], Cantabrig. [D]; WH signifies the readings which are adopted in the critical edition of *Westcott* and *Hort* (London 1881), Tisch. the readings of the editio octava critica major of *Tischendorf*.

¹ This list, sifted critically, seemed so much the more necessary, as, up to to-day, not only in the New Testament commentaries, but also in the excellent Clavis novi test. of *W. Grimm*, many errors and inaccuracies in reference to these words have been dragged along.

A. Single Appellatives and Proper Names.

**Āβḡā* (Tisch., on the contrary WH *āβḡā*; the same fluctuation regarding the accentuation of final *a* of the so-called Emphatic state is seen elsewhere—cf. below *γαββαθᾶ*, *γολγοθᾶ*, *μαμωνᾶ*—although properly speaking, only the circumflex is justifiable² = אֲבָא ὁ πατήρ, Mark XIV., 36 and elsewhere.

**Ἀκελδαμάχ* (so WH with B; on the contrary Tisch. *ἀκελδαμάχ* with S A. In favor of *ακ*, against *αχ* however is also *ακελδαμαχ* of codex D and *ακελδαμα* of codex E, i. e. Laudianus Oxoniensis; cf. the same difference, in the transcription of ק, below in *σα,χαχθανει* = שַׁכְתָּנִי and in *ρακα*) = חֲקֵל דְּמָא χωρίον αἵματος

Acts I., 19.—*ακελ* (for *ακαλ*) is probably due simply to the influence of *λ* upon the preceding vowel, *δαμα* for *δεμα* to the inclination elsewhere shown to conform the sound of the Sh'wā mobile to that of the following vowel; cf. *Gesenius-Kautzsch*, hebr. Gramm. § 10, 1, 2), Rem. and the literature in Note 3).—*Δαμάχ* instead of *δαμά* (so cod. E) reminds us of *Σειράχ* = סִירָא. If the Greeks

here actually heard such a sharp sound, why not in similar cases? or must we conclude that there was a misunderstanding of the writing דְּמָה, סִירָה, if not even that דְּמָח occurred as an error of the copyist? Concerning the addition of *κ* (e. g. *Σαραδακ*, Num. XXXIV., 8 = צָרְדָּה), elsewhere of *δ*, *θ*, *μ*, *ν*, *σ* to final vowels in the Septuagint cf. *Frankel*, Vorstudien zu den LXX. (Leipzig 1841), p. 97 sq.

Baraβḡās, *Βαρθολομαῖος*, *Βαριησοῦς*, *Βαριωνᾶ*, *Βαρνάβας*, *Βαρσαββᾶς*, *Βαρτιμαῖος*, all proper names compounded with בַּר son.

Βεεζεβοῦλ (so WH Matt. x., 25; XII., 24; Mark III., 22; Luke XI., 15, 18 sq. with S B while A C D [also S in Mark III., 22] present *Βεελζεβοῦλ*, the reading adopted by Tisch.; the suppression of the *λ* in the popular pronunciation, however, would be scarcely striking) = בְּעֵל זְבוּל (not בְּעֵל as even Grimm has it). Now זְבוּל is certainly not equal to the modern Hebrew זָבֵל *dung*, but

only the signification *dwelling* can be supported. In spite of this, the meaning of *Βεελζ.* as “*Master of the dwelling, or of the kingdom*” (so e. g. *Meyer* on Matt. x. 25, who finds a confirmation of this empty appellation in the preceding οἰκοδοσ-πότης) is to be rejected. *Zebûl* is rather a modification of *zebûb* (cf. בְּעֵל זָבוּב 2

Kgs. I., 2 and elsewhere), although in this modification may have co-operated not merely convenience of pronunciation (so *Baudissin*, art. “*Beelzebub*” in *Herzog's PRE*¹), but also the thought of זָבֵל *dung*, זָבוּל *dunging* (and also the offering of idolatrous sacrifices!).

Βηθεσδά (more correctly, according to what was remarked under *āβḡā—δᾶ*) = חֶסְדָּא בֵּית חֶסְדָּא, *House of Grace*, is the reading of A C in John v., 2; for חֶסְדָּא (instead of the elsewhere usual חֶסְדָּא) one need not appeal to the Syriac *chesdā*: reference to the Biblical-Aramaic חֶלְמָא *dream* is sufficient. On the contrary Tisch. and WH according to cod. Sin. have adopted *βηθσαθα* (WH place *βηθσαιδα* in the margin, as the reading of B). In the appendix p. 76, WH express the opinion that both readings (of S and B) are perhaps only bad

¹ Cf. *de Lagarde*, gesammelte Abhandlungen (Leipzig, 1866), p. 39, Note: “I always change the accents of foreign words according to my judgment; in 1 Cor., xvi., 22, one must write *μαρὰν ἀθᾶ*, or renounce the reputation of being an intelligent man.” This accentuation for אֲבָא, and similar words restored without doubt the actual tone as it existed in the living language, but it is to be remembered, on the other hand, that, when the penult is closed (not merely sharpened) the accent is carried over as paroxytone, cf. *πάσχα*, *Μάρθα*; properly speaking *σίκερα* also is clearly for *σίκρα* (שַׁכְרָא). Do these examples rest upon an accommodation to the Greeks and Romans, or may we derive from them a law (the accentuation of a closed penult before an open ultima), which afterwards had been entirely ignored by Jewish tradition? It is to be remarked, moreover, that, contrary to the above, in Jos. Antiq., 3, 7, 1 *χαναλας* (כְּהֲנִי) and 3, 10, 16 *ἀσαρθᾶ* (עֲצָרְתָא), appear to be transferred.

modifications of the same name, whose correct form is probably *βηθζαῖθά* [בֵּית זֵיתָא *House of Olives*]; nevertheless *βηθσαῖθά* equalling בֵּית צִירָא (cf. the local name in John i., 45) *place of fishery* is not impossible.

Βοανηργές (so Tisch. and WH with S A B C) is explained in Mark iii., 17 by *υἱοὶ βροντῆς*. The word offers, however, manifold difficulty. That *βοανη* is impure pronunciation for בְּנֵי, which the uncultivated Galileans spoke for בְּנֵי (so e. g.

Bretschneider in his *Lexicon novi testamenti*), is a monstrous assumption; not much better is the assertion, which *Lightfoot*, appealing to *Broughton*, has made current (*Horae hebr.* on Mark iii., 17), that the Jews had always pronounced *sh'wâ* as *oa*, e. g. *noabhyim* for נְבִיאִים and that hence *Strabo* writes *Moasada* for Masada [מִצְדָא ?]. As little does רְגִיש mean *thunder*, but a *noisy crowd of people* and the *Aram.* רְגִיש and רְגִיש is *rustling, noise*, not *thunder*.

Jerome is right in demanding for the meaning "son of thunder" *Benereem* (בְּנֵי רַעַם, commonly, to be sure, רַעַם). It is another question, however,

whether *Jerome* (on Dan. i., 8) on this account has a right to affirm: "Non ut plerique putant Boanerges, sed emendatius legitur Benereem," especially as he himself on Matt. x., 4 explains the name boanerges "ex firmitate et magnitudine fidei."¹ It appears to me in every way most probable that רְגִיש (רְגִיש)

anger, angry impetuosity, rather than רְגִיש, is contained in the word, and it is conceivable that this might be expressed by *υἱοὶ βροντῆς*. Or are we to assume with *Delitzsch* (*Saat auf Hoffnung* 1874, p. 208) a peculiar provincialism?

Γαββαθᾶ (Tisch.; WH γαββαθᾶ, cf. above on ἁββᾶ) John xix., 13 = גִּבְתָּא (emph. state of גִּבְתָּא *hill*, which is fem. of גִּב). Concerning the transcription of *sh'wâ* by a cf. above ἀκελδαμάχ.

Γολγοθᾶ (so Tisch.; WH γολγοθᾶ) with S A B D in Matt. xxvii., 33; for the elision of the λ cf. above under βεελζεβούλ; according to *Levy*, *neuhebr. und chald. Wörterbuch*, the pronunciation גִּלְגֻלְתָּא as emph. state of גִּלְגֻלְתָּא had been usual. In the Syriac *gāgultā*, the first *l* is elided and compensated by lengthening the vowel.

Ἐφφαθᾶ (WH and Tisch.) Mark vii., 34 with the best witnesses (S³ D ἐφφεθα, which would point to אֶתְפַּתַּח = אֶתְפַּתַּח *open thyself!* It is true that the

Pattah under פ could be for the purpose of conforming *sh'wâ* to the full vowel (see above on ἀκελδαμάχ) and the form consequently could be Ethp^hel; but in favor of Ethp^aal is the fact, that this form anyway is in use as passive to פָּתַח, and not less, that the Targum on Is. xlii., 7 expresses the opening of the eyes by Pa'il. With regard to ו for ת (with Dag.) cf. γολγοθα. Since moreover this Imperative, properly speaking, can refer only to the eyes, we must ask whether originally אֶתְפַּתַּח (with a suppression of the unaccented final vowel in Syr. fashion; cf. below κομμ in Mark v., 41) was not intended.

Κῆφας John i., 43 and elsewhere כִּיפָא, emph. state of כִּיף *rock*.

Λεγιών Mark v., 9 with S B C D, the Latin *legio*, but probably first by accommodation of the Aramaic לְגִיּוֹן.

Μαμωνᾶ (so Tisch.; WH μαμωνᾶ, see above on ἁββᾶ) = מָמוֹנָא emph. state of מָמוֹן.

The etymology is uncertain; for the writing מָמוֹנָא (so Grimm) rests upon the very doubtful derivation from אָמֵן (= object of confidence). The root מוֹן, assumed by *Levy*, (= מִנָּה, מִנֵּי) does not exist.

¹ Did *Jerome* have ἐνεργῆς in mind? We can suppose a great deal in his case!

De Lagarde, Gött. gel. Anz., 1884, p. 278, refers *μαμωνας* to מעמון, whose stem עמן corresponds to the Arabic مَعْمَن; מעמון weakens to מאמון, which is authenticated in one instance, became ממן or ממון, in a way similar to the change of יאמר finally to יאמר.

Μάρθα (cf. for the accentuation the Note under ἀββᾶ) Luke x., 38 and elsewhere = מרתא the mistress, emph. state from מרת, the fem. of מר lord.

Μεσσίας John i., 42 and elsewhere = משיחא emph. state from משיח anointed (Hebr. מִשִּׁיחַ); for the transcription, *Nöldeke* reminds us of *Ιεσσαί* for ישי.

Πάσχα (cf. for the accentuation the Note under ἀββᾶ) Matt. xxvi., 2, elsewhere = פסחא emph. state of פסח, which would correspond to the Hebrew פֶּסַח; Jewish tradition, on the contrary, demands פֶּסַח to which the Syr. peschā also corresponds.

*Παββοννί (so Tisch. Mark x., 51 and John xx., 16 with S A C; on the contrary WH *παββοννί* with B; far more badly attested is the reading *παββοννί*, although in John xx., 16, D also presents *παββοννί*) my Lord. The vocalization is surprising, for all other tradition knows only the forms רבן and רבון. Is *παββοννί* also a Galilean provincialism?

*Πακά (so WH Matt. v. 22 with S² B, on the contrary Tisch. *πακά* with S¹ D; cf. for this vacillation in the transcription of ק what was said above on ἀκελδαμαχ. according to what was remarked on ἀββᾶ, the word must be accented *πακά*); The word is not emph. state from קַי, but abbreviation from קַיִן empty, as יִחְנָא (proper name) from יִחְנִין. The vocalization is again surprising.

Σατανᾶς Matt. iv., 10 and elsewhere, emph. state of סטן; the form *σατᾶν* adopted by *Grimm*, with the Textus Receptus, 2 Cor. xii., 7, is only attested by S³ A² D² and ³.

Σίκερα (cf. for the tone under ἀββᾶ) Luke i., 15 = שכרא, emph. state of a presupposed שכר (not however directly for the Hebrew שֶׁכֶר as *Grimm* states).

Ταβερθά (more correct would be again —θᾶ) so WH Acts ix., 36 with B C, on the contrary Tisch. *Ταβερθά* with S A (cf. concerning the vacillation between ι and ει above in *παββοννί*) = טביתא emph. state of טביא *δορκᾶς* (cf. Hebrew צָבִי).

That instead of *tabhy^a*tha people spoke *tabhitha* with a resolution of the consonant Yodh, or to the Greek ear appeared so to speak, is not improbable; on the contrary, the form טביתא, with which *Grimm* identifies *ταβιθά*, is rather Syriac (cf. below at *ταλῖθα*).¹

I am reminded by *Siegfried's* Miscellanea II., 10 (in *Hilgenfeld's* Ztschr. f. wissensch. Theol. xxvii., 3, p. 358 sq.) that, after *ταβερθα*, *ωσαννα* (in Matt. xxi., 9 and other passages) should have been established. Cf. *Siegfried* in the passage cited: "In the New Test. Commentaries, as far as we have observed, *Ωσαννά* is reduced to the הושיעה נא of Ps. cxviii., 25 (cf. also *Grimm*, Lex.

N. T. 1879, p. 473^a). No doubt this was the passage intended, but the form *ωσαννά* can not be identified with נא "ה. As follows from *Elias Levita's* exposition in his *Sefer Tisbi*, the word is the Greek rendering of an abbreviated pronunciation of that petition, הושיע־נא, with which may be compared

هَوَّشِيْعَا in *Payne Smith*, Thes. Syr. T. I., 1879, p. 1639." In a Note *Siegfried* says: "Since writing the above, my attention having been called to *Hilgenfeld*, Nov. test. extra canon. receptum, fasc. iv., p. 26, I see that others also have taken exception to the derivation of *ωσαννά* from the form in Biblical Hebrew, and that *Anger* with *Hilgenfeld's* approval has referred to the Aramaic

¹ Levy in the neubeb. W B writes מַבִּיָּתָא and explains this from the Arabic *Sabbijjat* maid, girl (!), citing in addition to his own opinion *Fleischer*, who set the matter right already in a remark to *Levy's* Chald. WB ueber die Targumim (L. 426), with the formula "according to F. &c."!

אִישְׁעָנָא. There appears to be no doubt, therefore, as to the correctness of such an explanation." Cf. with this also *Hilgenfeld* (*Evangeliorum secundum Hebraeos*, etc. quae supersunt, Lips. 1884, p. 25), who gives the meaning *serva nos*, and appeals to *A. Merx* for the same.

As a characteristic of the popular language of that time, we may mention the striking abbreviations of many names, such as *Jose* for *Joseph*, *Lazaros* (לְעֹזֶר) for **אֶלְעֶזֶר**, **מַתִּי** (from which *Matthaios*, *Matthäus*) for **מַתְיָה**, *Salome* for **שְׁלֹמִית** and others; cf. *Delitzsch*, in the place mentioned, p. 206 sq.

B. Aramaic Sentences.

In Matt. xxvii., 46, Jesus cites from Psalm xxxii., 2, according to WH, *ἐλωί, ἐλωί* (so S, B on the contrary *ἐλωει*, A *ηλι*, D *ηλει*, hence Tisch. *ήλει*) *λεμὰ* (S B; more correct would be, moreover, again *λεμὰ*) *σαβαχθανεί* (S A; B has *σαβακτανει*, cf. above on *ακελδ.* and *ρακα*); the same in Tisch. leaving *ήλει* out of account. This would be accordingly **לְמָא שְׁבַקְתָּנִי אֱלֹהֵי א' אֱלֹהֵי**, in which of course the Hebrew **אֱלֹהֵי** (instead of the Aramaic, **אֱלֹהֵי**) before the Aramaic, **שְׁ ל' ש'** is very striking, since elsewhere, the pronunciation of *ā* like *ō* can not be established; on *σαβ*, for **שְׁב'** cf. above under *ακελδμαχ*. Of the oldest Uncials, only D gives the citation in Hebrew: *ηλει, ηλει, λαμα ζαφθανει* (= **עֲזַבְתָּנִי**). This reading is adopted by WH in the margin and, in the Appendix p. 21, is designated as "Western" (Gr. Lat.); probably it is an attempt to reproduce the Hebrew as distinguished from the Aramaic forms. In the parallel passage

Mark xv., 34, S A B C give *ελωι* (hence WH *ἐλωί*, Tisch. *ἐλωί*), next S C *λεμὰ* (so also Tisch., on the contrary WH with B D give *λαμὰ*, although this in Aramaic would be **לְמָא** nothing); finally, *σαβαχθανεί* (so WH and Tisch.) with S³ C; S¹ *σαβακτανει*, as in Matthew, on the contrary D again *ζαφθανει*, which also has got into the twisted reading of B (*ζαβαφθανει*).

According to this condition of things, the oldest tradition appears to be that the verse was cited by Jesus in Aramaic, and indeed with **אֱלֹהֵי** at the beginning; for *ελωι*, testifies moreover the circumstance that it agrees far less with the play upon *Elias* which was united with it than *ηλι* or *ηλει*. *De Lagarde* GGA, 1882, p. 329, finds in all this a proof of early and systematic corrections in the N. T. text.

Mark v., 41: *ταλιθά* (more correct would be once more — *θᾶ*, as well as *κοῦμ* afterwards) Tisch. with S A C (WH *ταλειθά* with B) *κοῦμ* (so WH and Tisch. with S B C; on the contrary A D *κουμι*). *Ταλιθά* is nevertheless again (cf. above in *ταβιθα*) not equal to **טְלִיתָא** (so *Grimm*), which would be Syriac, still less to **טְלִיתָא** (*Meyer*), but, properly speaking, to **טְלִיתָא**, fem. of **טְלִיא** *juvenis*. The best attested reading *κοῦμ* points to the suppression of the toneless final vowel in pronunciation, as in Syriac.

1 Cor. xvi., 22: *μαρὰν ἀθά* (better *ἀθᾶ*, cf. above on *ἀββᾶ*) WH and Tisch. according to all old witnesses: *our Lord is coming*, (or *has come*, see Appendix. T.) i. e. not **מְרַנָּא אַתָּה** (*Grimm*), with the confluence of the *a* of both words when these words were combined (*μαραναθα*), [but probably **מְרַנָּא**, as the form also sounds in Syriac; it is not in consistent with that, that in fact **מְרַנָּא** was written (cf. Bib. Aram. נַנְּ; perhaps more correctly נַנְּ), the toneless final vowel being suppressed in pronunciation.

Concerning the traces of the West-Aramaic dialect in Josephus, cf. *B. de Rossi* in the work already mentioned p. 55 sq.; *Pfannkuche* p. 459 sq. (both needing sifting); *Bleek*, Einl. ins A. Test., 3. ed., p. 54 sq. Concerning the influence which West-Aramaic exercised upon Josephus in his use of the Old Testament, an essay in *Joh. David Michaelis*' oriental. und exeget. Bibliothek V. (1773), p. 221 sq. contains something.

3. The so-called Targums or Translations of the Old Testament. The most important are: The Targum on the Pentateuch ascribed to *Onkelos* and the Targum to the prophets named after *Jonathan ben Uzziel*. There exist still, in addition to these, two Targums to the Pentateuch, called Jerusalem I., or Targum of Pseudo-*Jonathan* and Jerusalem II.; the latter is preserved only in fragments, or originally, was only a collection of Glosses belonging to an older Targum, a remodeled form of which lies before us in *Pseudo-Jonathan* (so *Geiger*, *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel*, Breslau, 1857, p. 455). On the Hagiographa also (except *Ezra*, *Nehemiah* and *Daniel*) there are Targums by different, some of them by very late, hands. The foundation may have been laid for the older Targums (*Onkelos*, *Jonathan*) as early as in the first century B. C., since, at the reading of the Scriptures in the Synagogues, single words and expressions which were no longer understood (see above, § 4) were to be orally interpreted by so-called **תרגומנים**, or Translators. Nevertheless, the process of fixing these interpretations in writing, and the gradual extension of them unto whole books continued for centuries, and was first brought to a comparative conclusion in the Babylonian Schools of the fourth century A. D. On the other hand, the final compilation of Pseudo-*Jonathan* was not earlier than the seventh century, and other Targums were still later. Even to-day we are far from having a critically-sifted consonant-text of the Targums, to say nothing of a unified and in a measure plausible vocalization.

Concerning the Targums generally, cf. the introductions to the O. T., especially *Bleek-Weilhausen*, p. 287 sq., and *Strack*, in *Zöckler's Handbuch der theol. Wissenschaften* I., 172 sq. (with abundant and careful references to the literature); further *Volck*, Art. "Thargumim" in *Herzog's PRE*,¹ 1862, Vol. XV.; *Th. Nöldeke*, *die alttestam. Literatur* (Leipzig, 1868), p. 255 sq.; *Schuerer*, *neutestam. Zeitgeschichte* (Leipzig, 1874), p. 475 sq., likewise with abundant specifications of the literature; *Weber*, *System der altsynagogalen palästinischen Theologie* (Leipzig, 1880), p. xi.-xix. A survey of the editions of the Targums is given by *Petermann*, *porta chaldaica*, ed. II. (Berlin, 1872), p. 82 sq. Noteworthy "Bemerkungen über die Vocalization der Targume" are given by *Merx* in the *Abhandlungen des Berliner Orientalistencongresses*, I., 142 sq.

4. Single sentences of the Mishna, the Gemaras of the so-called Jerusalem Talmud and detached traces in the Babylonian Talmud and the Midraschim.

For finding one's way in regard to the Mishna and the Talmuds in general, we refer here only to the excellent survey in *Schuerer's Neutestam. Zeitgeschichte*, p. 37 sq. In the Bab. Talmud, the Tractat *Nedarim* approaches the West-Aramaic idiom, and, in certain peculiarities, the Tractat *Nazir* also; cf. *Luzzatto*, *Gramm. der bibl.-chald. Sprache und des Idioms des Thalmud Babyli* (German by Krüger, Bresl., 1873), p. 54. There belongs here, from the Midrash-literature, the *Megillath Ta'anith*, or book of fasts cited already in the Mishna: cf. *Schuerer*, p. 54; *Strack*, art. "Midrasch" in *Herzog's PRE*,² Vol. IX., 759; *Braun*, "Entstehung und Werth der Meg. Taanit" in the *Monatsschr. f. Gesch. und Wissenschaft des Judenth.*, 1876, p. 375 sq., 410 sq., 445 sq.

5. The Samaritan Targum to the Pentateuch. This was probably composed in the first century A. D., though the final compilation, as far as we can speak of such a thing, may have been delayed until the fifth or sixth century. Besides this, there have been preserved only scanty remains of the Samaritan-Aramaic, in liturgies and songs.

This Aramaic Translation of the Pentateuch must not be confounded with the Samaritan Recension of the *Hebrew* Pentateuch. For the literature on the Samaritan Targum and the linguistic character of the same, cf. *Kautzsch*, art.

"Samaritaner" in Herzog's PRE,² Vol. XIII. (1884), especially p. 349 sq. In this place, also, it may be permitted to remind the reader emphatically, that every judgment of the Samaritan-Aramaic dialect based upon the editions of the Targum which have hitherto appeared, must fall necessarily into the gravest errors. This is true, alas, of the expensive Pentateuchus Samaritanus of *H. Petermann* (Fasc. I. Genesis, Berol. 1872; II. Exodus, 1882; III. Leviticus, 1883, the last edited by *C. Vollers*), after that, *Kohn* ("Zur Sprache, Litteratur und Dogmatik der Samaritaner," p. 103 sq. and 206 sq.) had proved conclusively that the usual assumption of peculiar (so-called Caucasian) roots and words in Samaritan-Aramaic, rests solely upon such a corruption of the MSS. of the Targum, as is incredible; according to *Kohn*, we possess, of the original Targum, perhaps only a few fragments (a relatively pure text is given only in the Petersburg fragments edited by *Kohn*, p. 215 sq., in the fragments of a Samaritan Targum, which *Nutt*, London, 1874, issued from a codex of the Bodleian Library and one of the Cambridge City Library, and, finally, in the "Pessach-Haggadah" edited by *Kohn*, on p. 1 sq., from a codex belonging to *Franz Delitzsch*). The original Samaritan—leaving out of account, perhaps, a somewhat large admixture of Hebraisms, as well as of Greek and Latin words—is as good as identical with the Palestine-Aramaic otherwise known to us.

6. The Written Remains of Aramaic on Stone and Papyrus, which originated (at least in the majority of cases) with Jews in Egypt.

Cf. *Gesenius*, scripturæ linguæque Phœnicæ monumenta, I. 226 sq.; III. tab. 4 (Alphabet) and tab. 29–33. Concerning the written characters cf. *Euting*, in the large table of characters in *Chwolson's* Corpus inscriptionum Hebraicarum (Petersb., 1882), col. 10–16, according to inscriptions dating from 482 to about 100 B. C.—The most important monuments of this kind were lately published by the Palæographical Society, Oriental Series, and they are; Part II. Table xxv. and xxvi., Papyrus cvi. of the British Museum (from the collection belonging formerly to the Duke of *Blacas*), with a description by *Wright* and *Nöldeke*, and the literature down to 1877. According to these men, this document dates from the last part of the Ptolemaic, or the earlier Roman period, composed either by a pagan Aramæan, or (more probably) by an Egyptian Jew, as a sort of Haggada to Exod. i. The Aramaic is strongly alloyed with Phœnician and Hebrew.—Further, Part V., Table LXIII., the column found in 1877, at Sakkara, now in the Royal Museum at Berlin, which represents a libation before Osiris, and bears a parallel Egyptian-Aramaic inscription, dating from the fourth year of Xerxes (482 B. C.); cf. *Lepsius*, concerning eine ägyptisch-aram. Stele, Ztschr. für ägypt. Sprache und Alterthumskunde, xv. (1877), p. 127 sq.; *Lauth*, ägypt.-aram. Inschriften, Report of the Session of the Munich Academy, 1878, I., philosophical-histor., class II., p. 97 sq. and 148; *Prætorius*, ZDMG xxxv., 442 sq.—Table LXIV: the celebrated stone with a four-line inscription, which is now kept in the Museum at Carpentras, in Southern France, and represents, above the inscription, a female mummy, and over this an adoration before Osiris. According to *Lepsius* and others, the stone belongs to the time of the Ptolemies; according to *Clermont-Ganneau* (see below) these Egypt.-Aram. monuments belong to the time of the Persian dominion over Egypt, i. e., 527–405, or 340–332, when Aramaic was the official language in Egypt; and the person named Taba upon the stone was daughter of a Persian officer and native Aramæan who had married an Egyptian woman. [If so, it is true that Hebraisms such as אִישׁ and קָהִי await an explanation]. Discussion over the stone has lately become animated again, since *Schlottmann* (ZDMG xxxii., 187 sq. and 767 sq.; xxxiii., 252 sq.) supposed that metre and rhyme are to be found upon the same; cf. *Halevy*, *ibid.*, xxxii., 206 sq.; *de Lagarde*, Nachrichten der Gött. gel. Ges., 1878, p. 357 sq. (also Symmicta, II., 56 sq. and 79 sq.) Of further documents, we mention the inscription upon a vase of the temple of Serapis, now in the Louvre (cf. *Levy*, ZDMG xi., 65 sq.; *Merx*, *ibid.*, xxii., 693 sq.; *Prætorius*, ZDMG, xxxv., 442; *Clermont-Ganneau*, Rev. Crit., 1883, No. 21, p. 415 sq.); for the Egyptian-Aramaic inscriptions generally. cf. *Clermont-Ganneau*, origine perse des monuments araméens d'Egypte, Rev. archéolog., vol. 36, p. 93 sq. and 37, p. 21 sq. (also separately, Paris, 1880).

Of extra-Jewish origin are:

7. The Palmyrene Inscriptions found in the ruins of Tadmor (Palmyra) and for the most part bi-lingual (Aram.-Greek).

Facsimiles of these inscriptions were given first by *R. Wood*, *The Ruins of Palmyra* (London 1753; see the older literature in *de Wette-Schrader*, Einl. ins A. T., p. 79); in later times: *Levy* ZDMG xv., 615 sq. and xviii., 65 sq., where nineteen inscriptions are given, dating from 396-578 of the Seleucidan era (85-267 A. D.); an addition thereto *ibid.* Vol. xix., 314 and xxiii., 282 sq.; further in *Count de Vogue's* *Syrie centrale* (Paris 1868 sq.), as well as in extract 5 of the *Journal asiat.* 1883; more than all however by *Euting* in the *Corpus inscriptionum Semiticarum* II., Table 17-28 (Inscriptions from 9 B. C. to 270 A. D.). *Blau* ZDMG xxviii., 73 sq. (über ein palmyr. Relief mit Inschrift); *Mordtmann*, *Neue Beiträge zur Kunde Palmyras* in the Report of the Munich Academy 1875, Vol. II., Suppl.-Number III., 1-88; *Ed. Sachau*, *palmyr. Inschriften*, ZDMG xxxv., 728 sq., Remarks thereupon by *Nöldeke* xxxvi., 664 sq. For other matter see *Euting* in the report of the DMG for 1878, p. 63 and in *Baethgen's* Report for 1880, *ibid.* p. 154. Concerning the linguistic character of this inscription, cf. *Merx* ZDMG xxii., 674 sq. and especially *Nöldeke* *ibid.* xxiv., 85 sq.; *Sachau* *ibid.* xxxvii., 562 (without any notice of *Nöldeke's* previous work). In content, they are partly pagan dedicatory inscriptions, partly inscriptions in honor of deserving persons and partly epitaphs.

8. The Numerous Inscriptions and Coins of the Nabateans on the Sinai-Peninsula, in Idumea, the Hauran and elsewhere, from the last century B. C. and the first A. D.

Misled by the numerous Arabic names, which occur in these inscriptions, they were regarded by scholars, for a long time, as Arabic. So particularly *Tuch*, ZDMG II., 395 sq.; III., 129 sq. and so yet *Böttcher*, *Ausführl. Lehrb. der heb. Sprache* I, p. 6, where these inscriptions are explained as North-Western Arabic (set right by *Muehlau* in the Supplement p. 644, where also is the older literature). A more correct judgment on this question was established by *Levy*, ZDMG xiv., 363 sq.; xvii., 82 sq.; xviii., 630; xxii., 261 sq.; xxiii., 435 sq. and 652 sq.; xxv., 429 sq. and 508; xxvii., 133; further *Blau* *ibid.* xvi., 331 sq., *Meier* *ibid.* xvii., 575 sq.; and in particular *Nöldeke* *ibid.* xvii., 703 sq. and xix., 637 sq., as well as *de Vogue* in the *Revue archéol.* 1864, p. 284 sq. (Inscriptions from the Hauran); the same in the *Mélanges d'archéol. orient.*, p. 149 sq. and Appendice p. 21 sq. (Coins of the Nabatean kings from 95 B. C. to 104 A. D.; concerning two such from Petra, cf. also *de Saulcy* in the *Mél. de Numism.* 1878, 193 sq.) and in *Syrie centrale* (1868) p. 89 sq., finally *Euting* in the *Corpus inscriptionum semiticarum* II. (Paris 1883), tab. 29-35; and Table LXv., Part v. of the *Oriental Series* issued by the Palaeograph. Society.

9. More voluminous remnants of the West-Aramaic dialect and likewise of extra-Jewish origin lie before us in a translation of the Bible, preserved in a Vatican MS. of the Gospels, which was completed 1030 A. D., as well as in London and Petersburg MSS. (These last contain it in union with other fragments of religious matter).

The text of the Vatican MS., which embraces about two-thirds of the Gospels, was edited by *F. Miniscalchi Erizzo*, 2 tomi, Verona 1861 and '64. For the "Christian-Palestinian" dialect of this version, cf. *Nöldeke*, ZDMG xxii., 443 sq.; according to him, the translation originated between the third and the sixth centuries A. D. and probably upon Judæan soil (*Blau*, *ibid.* xxiii., 266 sq., seeks to refer the localities mentioned in the annotations of the Vat. Codex to the ancient Decapolis). Further fragments of this version (for the most part Palimpsests) are to be found in London and St. Petersburg; the latter were collected by *Tischendorf* upon his second and third journeys (59 and 70 leaves). All these fragments (except the Vat. Codex), with fragments of Biographies of Saints, Hymns etc., were edited by *Land* as "fragmenta syropalaestina" in Tom. IV. of his *Anecdota syriaca* (Lugd. Bat. 1875), including fragments from the Psalms (which are trans-

lations from the Septuagint, as the arithmetical figures [Bezifferung] show), from the London and Petersburg Gospels (of which the London exhibits, according to Land, a Melk—[a celebrated Benedictine Abbey founded in 1089. T.] Ritual older than the Roman Codex, while, in the Petersburg Bible, an older and quite peculiar and a younger Codex are to be distinguished), finally London fragments from Deuter., Isaiah, Proverbs, with Petersburg fragments from the Gospels, Deuter., Isaiah and Job. According to Land, the Roman Codex is later than almost all the other fragments. (The London ones are placed by *Wright* between the eighth and the thirteenth centuries.) At the time of its origin, accordingly, at the beginning of the eleventh century, Aramaic was no longer the language of intercourse in the circles concerned with it, as the Arabic inscriptions show. The writing, according to *Land*, is a variety of the capitals used for books at Edessa, which withal the Greek capitals have imitated in the rude and angular character of the letters.

10. Living remains of this dialect, once so widely diffused, are found at present only in Ma'lula and two neighboring villages upon the Eastern declivity of Anti-Lebanon, of course in a bad state of decay and, as the entire population speaks Arabic as well, near its end.

This fact was made clear long ago by *Brown* and *Volney* (cf. *Renan*, *histoire générale* p. 268). Closer information with reference to the language itself was first given by the missionary *Jules Ferrette* in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* xx., 431 sq.; *Nöldeke* discusses the same ("über den noch lebenden syrischen Dialekt im Antilibanon") *ZDMG* xxi., p. 183 sq.; cf. the remarks of *Merx* thereupon *ibid.* xxii., 271 sq. A farther list of words of the Ma'lula-dialect was published by *Cl. Huart*, who visited Ma'lula in the autumn of 1877, in the *Journal asiatique*, Ser. vii., Vol. xii., 478 sq. (Oct.-Dec. 1878; cf. the notice of *R. Duval* *ibid.* xiii., 465 sq. and *L'univers Israélite*, 1879, No. 16). Accurate and comprehensive disclosures are still to be expected from *Socin* and *Prym*, who passed several weeks in Ma'lula in the latter part of the summer of 1869, and carefully transcribed, from the mouth of a Christian woman¹ of the Greek confession, a series of narratives with Arabic translation. The following sample, for which I am indebted to Prof. *Socin*, may give an idea of the condition of this Aramaic: vōt āhād ishme froz lalō ile hōna, i. e. (ה)וֹת אֶחָד אִשְׁמָה פְּרוֹז לָאֵלֹהָ (א) אִיִּתְּ לֵה (א)חֶנָּה = there was a man whose name was Faragh 'allah, he has (had) a little brother etc.

§ 6. CONCERNING THE CORRECT NAME FOR THE ARAMAIC DIALECT FOUND IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.

1. In the designation of the Aramaic dialects generally, and of the Biblical-Aramaic in particular, such confusion prevails even yet in many ways, that it is necessary to supplement what has been said with a confirmation of the terminology employed (§ 1). The view derived from Dan. ii., 4, that the Aramaic dialect in Daniel and Ezra was the language of the Chaldean people, has, as its first consequence, the misconception that, not only this dialect, but also the nearest related dialect, that of the Targums, etc., were designated as "Chaldaic;" secondly, however, there flowed out of it the inverted distinction of this pretended Chaldaic, as the East-Aramaic, from Syriac, as "West-Aramaic," while the reverse is correct. The distinction proposed by *Fürst*² of the (so-called) Chaldaic and of the Syriac as "Jewish and Christian Aramaic," is

¹ One of these villages has gone over to Islam, but speaks its Aramaic dialect. Moreover, the tradition of the language is maintained chiefly by women; the language of the men is already greatly corrupted by the influence of the Arabic.

² *Lehrgebaude der Aram. Idiome, Chald. Gramm.* (Leipzig, 1835) p. 5; there again, however, *Fuerst* distinguishes Jewish East-Aramaic (the language of the Bab. Talmud) as "Bab.-Aram.-Heb." from the "Palest.-Aram.-Hebrew," as well as from the Syriac.

not altogether suitable, according to what is laid down in § 5; for to the East-Aramaic dialects belongs, not only the dialect of Edessa used by the Christian Syrians, but also the language of the Babylonian Talmud; it follows no less from § 5, No. 7-10, that extra-Jewish monuments have been preserved, which belong to the West-Aramaic group. More suitable is the designation of the West-Aramaic as *Palestinian Aramaic*,¹ inasmuch as the remnants of this dialect yet existing arose for the most part (except the Palmyrene, the Egyptian and almost all the Nabatean inscriptions) upon the soil of Palestine. In the list of these (South) West-Aramaic or Palestinian Aramaic dialects belongs now the dialect lying before us in Daniel and Ezra, which we most fitly designate as "Biblical Aramaic."

In Daniel II., 4^a, we are informed that the Kasdim, or Chaldeans, summoned by Nebuchadnezzar, addressed him in Aramaic (אַרְמִית), and, in fact, their dialogue with the king (v. 4b sq.) is reported in the Aramaic language. Accordingly, it was plainly the opinion of the author of the book of Daniel (or of ch. I.-VII.) that this Aramaic dialect was the language of conversation at the court of Nebuchadnezzar and his successors, instead of the East-Semitic dialect whose Babylonian form lies before us in numerous inscriptions—among others, those of Nebuchadnezzar himself. This *real* "Chaldaic," which is mentioned in Jer. v., 15, as a language unintelligible to the Jews (cf. the similar verdict of Isa. XXVIII., 11 and XXXIII., 19, with regard to Assyrian), the author of Daniel conceives as the secret or learned language of the Magians, since he (I., 4) lets the Jewish boys be instructed in the language and literature of the Chaldeans; כְּשָׁדִים is here used surely in no other sense than everywhere else in Daniel (except v., 30, in the connection מֶלֶךְ ב' and IX., 1, מְלָכֹת ב'); and the dialect designated correctly in Dan. II., 4 (also Ez. IV., 7) אַרְמִית has been termed, since Jerome (on Dan. II., 4), the "Chaldaic," just on account of a misunderstanding of the word כְּשָׁדִים.² The author of Daniel uses the word as a title for the members of the Babylonian guild of priests, as already Herodotus regards οἱ Χαλδαῖοι as a designation of the priests of Baal, and the name was subsequently the customary one for the Magians, Astrologers, Soothsayers, etc., of the East. Jerome, however, and those who followed him, confused therewith the use of כְּשָׁדִים as name of the people; and since, in Dan. II., 4, the "Chaldeans" speak Aramaic, so "Chaldaic" and "Aramaic" were held to be identical. And the matter has stood thus in the "Chaldee grammars" and the "Hebrew and Chaldee lexicons," in spite of all protests,³ up to this day.

2. In possession of the correct terminology there falls to the ground the fable (still stated up to the latest date), that the Jews in the Babylonian exile forgot their Hebrew and, instead of it, brought the "Chaldaic," the language of conversation, with them to Palestine (cf. e. g. Zunz, die gottesdienstl. Vorträge

¹ This terminology has already been proposed by Pfannkuche in Eichhorn's Allg. Bible., viii., 3, p. 469.

² It is, to be sure, questionable, whether this misunderstanding comes upon Jerome himself or upon his Jewish teachers. For the latter, might be cited the fact that, in the Massora to the Targum of Onkelos (cf. Berliner's Edition of the same, p. xviii. sq.), the Targum-Aramaic (as distinguished from the Biblical) is designated repeatedly as לִשְׁנָא דְכַסְרָא language of the Chaldeans. Without doubt, the composition of this Massora belongs, according to Berliner (ibid., p. ix.), as late as about 900 A. D., though Berliner at this point reminds us of the passage Chullin 24 a, according to which לִשְׁנֵי כְּשָׁדִים in Dan. i., 4, means the Aramaic language.

³ Cf. already Schloezer in Eichhorn's Repertorium, viii. (1781), p. 118 sq.; the correct distinction of East-Aramaic (Syriac) and West-Aramaic (Biblical Aramaic and the language of the Targums) was expressly drawn again by Geiger ZDMG, xviii., 654, and Noeldeke, ibid. xxi., 183 sq., and particularly xxv., 113 sq. (die Namen der aram. Nation und Sprache.)

der Juden, Berl. 1832, p. 7 sq.; *Herzfeld*, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel* III., 44 sq.; *Böttcher*, *ausführliches Lehrb. der hebr. Sprache* I., 18). Leaving out of account that it was the normal practice in Jerusalem about 430 B. C., according to Neh. XIII., 24, to speak יְהוֹדִית,¹ and that the slow overthrow of Hebrew by Aramaic may be shown upon valid grounds (cf. above p. 4 sq.), the Jews could not take a dialect from Babylon which was not spoken there.

3. With regard to the designations of the West-Aramaic dialect used in antiquity, the following is yet to be brought forward:—In the New Testament, this dialect is designated as ἑβραϊστί *Hebrew* (so certainly in John V., 2; XIX., 13, 17, perhaps also in XIX., 20 and with the obscure ἀρμαγεδων Rev. XVI., 16), although the same word is elsewhere applied (so surely in Rev. IX., 11, perhaps also in John XIX., 20 and Rev. XVI., 16; certainly, moreover, already in the Prologue of Jesus Sirach) to designate the old Hebrew language. The meaning of the expression ἡ ἑβραϊς διάλεκτος, Acts XXI., 40 and XXII., 2, as well as XXVI., 14, (as already the ἑβραϊς φωνή 4 Mac. XII., 7 and XVI., 15) is doubtful. In the first two passages, the deep silence of the people reported in XXII., 2 favors the old Hebrew, for this silence is less easily explained, if the Apostle used the vernacular familiar, for the most part, to all hearers in the neighborhood; on the contrary, he could place on record his Pharisaic education and his *future* zeal for the Law (cf. v. 3) no better than in the use of the sacred tongue. In Acts XXVI., 14 also, it corresponds more to the importance and solemnity of what is recorded, to think of the old Hebrew and not of the Aramaic vernacular.² With the New Testament, Josephus also uses *Hebrew* (γλῶττα τῶν Ἑβραίων), as well of old Hebrew, as of the Aramaic vernacular of his time.

4. Further on, within the Christian era, *Syrian* and *Syriac*, which, for a long time, had been used for the purpose almost invariably by the Greeks, were fixed as designations of the whole department of Aramaic just as, already, the LXX. had everywhere rendered אֲרָמִית by σιριστί. According to *Nöldeke* (ZDMG xxv., 116), this name was adopted by the Christian Aramæans and for the reason that, to a Jew, "Aramean" had become identical with "Heathen" and, in the same sense, had passed over to the Syriac translation of the New Testament (e. g., Acts XVI. 1 and XIX., 10, for Ἑλλῆν; Gal. II., 14, אַרְמַאִית for ἐθνικῶς). Just so, the Palestinian Jews called all Aramaic סְוֶרְסִי, while the designation אַרְמִי was preserved (at least for the language [לִשׁוֹן אַרְמִי]) by the Babylonian Jews; see the evidence in *Nöldeke*, 116 sq. as well as the proof, *the same* p. 117 sq., that the form 'armâjê is to be regarded as the original designation of the nation: "as however the idea of 'Heathen' was united with this form, 'arâmâjê was artificially set apart from it as name of the people"—a distinction which can be proved from the Jewish sources (cf. *Levy*, *neu-hebr. u. chald. W.-B.* under אַרְמִי and אַרְמַאִי). The Aramaic portions of the Old Testament (including Jer. x., 11 and the two words in Gen. XXXI., 47)

¹ Quite mistaken is the appeal of the Talmud to Neh. viii., 8 as proof that the people then needed an "interpretation" of the Law; כִּפְרִישׁ does not mean in that passage any more than in Ezra iv., 18, "interpreted," but simply "clearly, distinctly" (Vulg. manifeste).

² So also *Delitzsch*, the *Hebrew New Testament*, p. 30 (cf. above § 4, Note); in "Saar auf Hoffnung" 1874, p. 210 *Delitzsch* still supposed that: "with a call in this (Palestinian Aramaic) language *Schaul*, *Schaul*, *lema redaft jathi*, the ascended Lord brought Saul of Damascus to his senses."

are curtly called **תרגום** in the Mishna and Talmud (see the proofs in *Nöldeke* p. 128), because written in the language which is elsewhere employed for the interpretation (targūm) of Scripture, as contrasted with **מקרא**, the Scripture composed in the sacred language.^{1*} The designation of the vernacular of Palestine at the time of Jesus as the "Syro-Chaldaic," which was for a long time customary (though of course very unfortunate), might likewise be traced to *Jerome*; cf. *Jerome* adv. Pelag. III., 1: The Gospel of the Hebrews is "chaldaico syroque sermone, sed hebraico literis scriptum."

§ 7. CONCERNING THE BIBLICAL-ARAMAIC TEXTS IN GENERAL.

Of the remnants of the West-Aramaic idiom in the Old Testament enumerated in § 1, the two words transmitted in Gen. xxxi., 47 might reach back to sometime in the ninth century B. C., in case the verse containing them belonged to one of the old sources of the Pentateuch. Even if this verse can be shown to be an addition by the last (post-exilic) redactor of the Pentateuch however—and, in fact, an activity in the direction of redaction is very prominent in the welding of the sources of vv. 45 sq.—we should have in it probably the oldest sample of the Biblical-Aramaic dialect, since there can be no doubt that Jer. x., 11 is a gloss, introduced at some time or other into the text of the prophet, and the redaction of the present text of Ezra can not be placed earlier than the last quarter of the fourth century B. C.

1. If Gen. xxxi., 47 originated from one of the ancient sources of the Pentateuch (J or E) it could not be shown, from the form of the two words in question, that their use as words of Laban the "Aramæan," (cf. vv. 20 and 24) from Haran in Mesopotamia, prove them to be *East-Aramaic*; for the Massoretic writing **שְׁהֲרֹתָא** with Qāmets in the first syllable might be vowelled correctly for West-Aramaic (as for Syriac); from initial **ש** (instead of **ס** in the Targums and in Syriac, cf. § 9, Rem. 2), no conclusion can be drawn; moreover the same corresponds in this root regularly to the Arabic *shn*. The noun **נֶגֶר** may be verified as well from the Syriac as from the Targums.

2. That Jer. x., 11, in spite of the LXX., who seem to have had the verse before them, is a gloss introduced wrongfully into the text, follows directly from the troublesome interruption of the original connection between vv. 10 and 12; indirectly, however, from the fact that no reasonable ground for the sudden insertion of an *Aramaic* verse can be discovered; for that this verse was meant to indicate to the Jews how they must answer the Chaldeans, to whom they could have spoken only in "Chaldaic," is too trifling an argument to deserve serious refutation. It is striking that, in this gloss, together with the usual **אֶרְעָא** the *Earth* is found the form **אַרְקָא**, which seems to have belonged to the East-Aramaic and perhaps was intruded into the verse at some time in Babylonia.² The remaining forms, such as **דִּי** (almost invariably **ד** in East-Aramaic), **תַּאֲמָרוּן** (Syr. **תַּאֲמ**, in Babylonian also **תַּיִמ**), **לָהֶם** (cf. Ezra v., 3 and elsewhere) correspond to the

¹ In the Midrasch Beresith rabba to Gen. xxxi., 47, is ascribed to Samuel bar Nachman the verdict that the "Persian" language should not be lightly esteemed, since God has honored it in the Law (here, at Gen. xxxi., 47), the Prophets (Jer. x., 11) and the Kethubhim (Dan. ii., 4 sq., Ezra iv., 8 sq.). Here **לֶשׁוֹן פֶּרֶס** can be only an ancient error of the text for **לֶשׁוֹן רַס**.

* This Talmudic terminology might be cited as evidence for the opinion of *Lenormant*, followed by *Dr. W. H. Ward*, that Daniel and Ezra were originally written entirely in Hebrew, and that portions of them being lost, their place was supplied by the corresponding Aramaic Translation (Targum). See *Old Testament Student* for Nov., 1883, pp. 90, 91. [T.]

² **אַרְקָא** is not protected, indeed, from the suspicion of an ancient copyist-error, a suspicion which lies near at hand, by the fact that it is enumerated by the Jews (naturally according to

West-Aramaic idiom. The clearly Hebrew word אלה added at the close, if it belongs to the gloss at all, must have been added by a Hebrew copyist.

The Aramaic sections in Daniel and Ezra are distinguished more by lexical than grammatical peculiarities. At all events, the few differences, which we will mention in their proper places, do not justify the verdict, that in the book of Daniel, the decomposition of the Aramaic has already advanced much further (Renan, *hist. générale*, p. 219).

§ 8. THE TEXTUAL TRADITION AND GRAMMATICAL TREATMENT OF THE BIBLICAL ARAMAIC.

The Aramaic texts, of a religious content, proceeding from Jews and Samaritans, are all, in the nature of things, originally more or less strongly influenced by the Hebrew;¹ and, in this sense, the distinction mentioned above (§ 6, 1), of Jewish and Christian Aramaic (the latter largely influenced by the Greek) is justified. Similarly, the Biblical Aramaic also bears strong traces of the Hebrew influence; only, a great part of the Hebraisms might be placed to the account of later copyists, of whom some were ignorant of Aramaic, and some designedly adjusted it to the Hebrew. The text has suffered no less corruption in the printed editions, however; until such a multitude of asserted variations has arisen as, e. g., the stereotype edition of *Hahn* finds it necessary to present. The prevailing confusion was very recently checked, for the first time, by the superior text which *S. Baer* fixed in his edition of Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah (Lpz., Tauchnitz, 1882) on the basis of the best manuscript and other witnesses. Hence, we have everywhere based our assertions upon it. In so doing, it must never be forgotten that even this text is only the relatively oldest and most certain form of the *Massoretic tradition*, and in no wise offers security that we have before us, in all particulars of writing and pronunciation, the texts intended by the authors of Daniel and Ezra. This assumption is impossible; because the Massoretes, in certain cases, have, without reason, substituted another pronunciation for the one demanded by the consonant text; in other places, have conspicuously wavered in the vocalization of the same form, and sometimes have made mistakes which may be demonstrated. Not rarely, also, reference to the form of West-Aramaic, acquired from the Targums, may have influenced the pointing (cf. Renan, in the work mentioned, p. 220). Although, therefore, the grammatical exposition must everywhere proceed from the critically fixed Massoretic tradition, it must, nevertheless, at least not withdraw from a criticism of this tradition, when the text, by its deviation from analogous phenomena of the Biblical Aramaic, or of West-Aramaic in general, is suspicious.

The literature of grammars for Biblical Aramaic is considered in *Steinschneider's* "bibliograph. Handbuch über die theoret. und prakt. Liter. für hebr. Sprachkunde" (up to 1850), Lpz. 1859. Cf., further, the survey in *Petermann's Porta Chaldaica*, ed. II., p. 80 sq.; by *Volck*, in *Herzog's PRE²I*, 604 sq.; *Reuss*, *Gesch. der hl. Schriften des A. Test.*, p. 511; *Strack*, *Einleitung ins A. Test.*, p. 191 sq.—

Jer. x., 11), among the four, seven, or ten names of the earth, but is so by its unquestionable occurrence upon the large fragments brought from the Assyrian Royal-palaces to the British Museum (cf. *Levy*, *Gesch. der jued. Muenzen*, Leipzig, 1862, p. 149). For ארקה in Mandaic, cf. *Noeldeke*, *Mand. Gramm.*, p. 73. The change of sound appears sufficiently guaranteed by the Aramaic ארקה, to smoke, beside the Hebrew ארקה, to burn incense.

¹ For the Hebraisms in the Targum of Onkelos, which is commonly regarded as the most genuine monument of the South-Western Idiom, cf. *Geiger* in *ZDMG*, xviii., 653 sq.

There have been added, since these were published: the Paradigms placed at the beginning of the edition of Daniel, Ezra and Nehemiah by *Baer* (see above); tolerable caution is necessary in using these, since, for the sake of completeness, many forms are adopted which cannot be made good, and which even contradict the remaining analogy; further, the third edition of *Winer's* "chaldäische Grammatik für Bibel und Targummim," enlarged by directions for the study of the Midrasch and Talmud, edited by Rabbi *B. Fischer*, Lpz., 1882. Fortunately, the editor has distinguished his own additions by cursive type, and, in that way, has facilitated the omission of them, which, for the beginner, is, in the highest degree, necessary.

CORRECTION.—P. 102, l. 5. For "cf. *Schüerer* p. 505 and in other places," read "cf. *Schuerer* in the place mentioned p. 505."

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES.

BY PROF. JOHN P. PETERS, PH.D.

Philadelphia, Pa.

In the 9th edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, in the article "Amalekites," occurs what seems to be a curious case of the propagation of error. We read: "It has been generally supposed that the Haman of the Book of Esther, called 'the Agagite,' belonged to the royal line of the Amalekites; but it is now found, from Assyrian records, that Agagi was the name of a country east of Assyria, from which it may be assumed that the title was derived. See Lenormant, *Lettres Ass.* I., 45." M. Lenormant mentions as eighth among the minor cantons of Media "Agazi...., called Agagi.... in the inscriptions of the *Fastes*. It is the Agagi of the Book of Esther." In the *Fastes* M. Oppert gives the cuneiform characters for *Agazi*, but transliterates falsely *Agagi*. M. Lenormant has copied his error, and on that error the article in *Enc. Brit.* has based a new theory regarding Haman. It is curious to observe that at Esther III., 1, the Septuagint reads for *הַאֲגַגִּי*, *βουγαῖον*, while in III., 10; VIII., 3, 5, the Gentile name is omitted, and in IX., 24, *ὁ Μακεδών* is used. Josephus *Ant. Jud.*, XI., 6, 5, translates Agagite by *Ἀμαληκίτης*. M. Lenormant cites from *Ptolemaeus* the name *Ἀζαγα* or *Ἀζαζα* as probably the Median canton called *Agazi* by the Assyrians.

Prof. Noeldeke, in the *Sitzungsberichte der königlich preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, gives a provisional account of an Aramæan inscription discovered by Prof. Euting at Teima (تَيْمَاء, תִּימָא), in an oasis of Northern Arabia, on the borders of the Syrian desert. In Gen. XXV., 15; 1 Chron. I., 30, תִּימָא appears as a son of Ishmael. It is mentioned in Is. XXI., 14, in the מִשְׁנֵה בְּעֶרְבָה. In Jer. XXV., 23 and Job VI., 19 (תַּמָּא) it appears as a commercial place or people. The Septuagint writes it *Θαυμάν*, confusing it with the famous Edomite canton of that name. Ritter and Wetzstein identify תִּימָא with Taimâ in the Haurân, whom Cheyne has followed in his commentary on Isaiah. A somewhat similar confusion will be found to exist regarding דְּדָן, which is connected in Isaiah and Jeremiah with תִּימָא. The inscription, which is confidently assumed to antedate the Persian conquest, belonging to a period between 500 and 800 B. C., has been, so far as preserved, transliterated into Hebrew characters, as follows:

(Lines 1—9 are gone almost entirely.)

- | | |
|---------------------------------|-----|
| הגם להן אלהי | 10. |
| תימא (י) חצן לצלם שזב בר פטסרי | 11. |
| ולזרעה בבית צלם זי הגם וגבר | 12. |
| זי יחבל סותא זן אלהי תימא | 13. |
| ינסחוהי וזרעה ושמה מן אנפי | 14. |
| תימא והא [זא] צדקתא זי . . . | 15. |
| צלם זי מחר . ושנגלא . . אשז . א | 16. |
| אלהי תימא לצלם [זי] הגם א . | 17. |
| מן חקלא דקלן . . . ומן שימת א | 18. |
| זי מלכא דקלן [זי] כל דקלן | 19. |
| זי . . . [שנה] בשנה ואלהן ואנש | 20. |
| לא יהני בצלם שזב בר פטסרי | 21. |
| מן ב . תא זן . ולזרעה ושמה | 22. |
| כמן . . . לא . . . | 23. |

For this is suggested the translation:

- | | |
|-----|--|
| 10. | הגם. But may the gods |
| 11. | of Teimâ protect (?) the image of שזב, son of Petosiri, |
| 12. | and his seed in the house of the image of הגם. And a man |
| 13. | who injures this? may the gods of Teimâ |
| 14. | remove him and his seed and his name from the surface |
| 15. | of Teimâ! And this is the duty which |
| 16. | the image of |
| 17. | the gods of Teimâ to the image of הגם: |
| 18. | from the field ten date-palms and from the treasure |
| 19. | of the king ten date-palms, altogether of date-palms |
| 20. | twenty-one year by year. And gods and men |
| 21. | shall derive no profit from the image of שזב, son of Petosiri. |
| 22. | and to his seed and his name |

To the left hand, above, is a sceptre-bearing image, which Euting describes as "the portrait of king in pure Assyrian costume." Below this is a priest offering at an altar, underneath which is written **צלם שזב כמרא**, "Image of שזב, the priest."

The language of the whole is Aramæan, and the characters are said to belong to the oldest type, resembling those on the Babylonian contract tables and the lion of Abydos. For the wide-spread use of the Aramæan language, in the time of the Assyrian supremacy, Noeldeke and Landauer compare 2 Kgs. xviii., 26, and Is. xxxvi., 11. The name Petosiri is explained as the Egyptian Pet-Osiri. The stone itself is now on the way to Germany.

In the possession of a gentleman in New York is a fragment of a synagogue-roll which claims a romantic history. In the last Kurdo-Persian war the little town Meyandop was sacked by the Kurds, and among the other plunder was a synagogue roll. This was purchased by a shoemaker, who used the greater part of it in his trade. Before it was entirely destroyed, however, a missionary from Oroomiah saw and bought it. From him part passed into the hands of an Armen-

ian student, who brought it to this country, but the larger part is said to have gone to the St. Petersburg Museum. The part in this country contains Ex. xxix., 32, to end of book. The length of the roll is twenty inches, about six inches of which are margin. There are fifteen columns of manuscript. It does not seem to be old.

In his *Keilschrifttexte Sargon's*, Dr. Lyon adds one word to our knowledge of the Hittite language. In the *Stier-Inschrift*, 67-69, we read: "bît appâtê tamšil êkal Hattê ša ina lisân mât aħarrê bît ħilāni išassûšu ušêpiša mēħrit bâbêšin." (A portico after the manner of a Hittite temple, which in the language of the West-land bît-ħilāni they call, I caused to be built before their doors.) For this particular form of architecture compare also 1 Kgs. vi., 3.

In his latest work, *Die Sprache der Kossäer*, note on p. 61, Prof. Friedrich Delitzsch practically announces his acceptance of the view of Schrader and Hommel, that the כּוּשׁ in Gen. ii., 13, x., 8, is a mistake for כִּשׁ. Such a mistake would be a natural and easy one to make, both being originally written כּשׁ. In Assyrian inscriptions we find Ku-u-šu or Ku-su, Ethiopian, the כּוּשׁ of Gen. x., 7, and Kaššu, which is the כּוּשׁ (or כִּשׁ) of x., 8. In *Wo lag das Paradies*, Delitzsch maintained a different view, supposing כּוּשׁ of Gen. x., 7 to be identical with כּוּשׁ of Gen. x., 8, and similarly connecting the Kûšu and the Kaššu. The Kaššu were the "Elamite-Sumerian" stratum of peoples to the north and west of the Persian gulf. He was also inclined to connect them with the Kašda or Kaldu (כּשְׁדִים). In the present work, on the other hand, he attempts to prove, from an examination of the forty or more Kossæan words now known, that no linguistic connection existed between the Kaššu and either the Sumerian-Accadians or the Elamites. Mr. Theo G. Pinches writes, in opposition to this view, in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, Vol. xvi., Part 2, maintaining the linguistic connection of Kossæan and Sumerian-Accadian. Prof. Haupt, writing in the *Andover Review* (July), also seems to think that the little we know points in the direction of such a connection. Prof. Delitzsch holds that the Kaššu came from the mountains of the north-east, and gained control of Babylonia about 1500, B. C. Karduniaš (his 𒊕𒌷) was the special seat of their settlement. The nine kings of an Arabian dynasty, mentioned by Berosus, he regards as Kossæan, and, like Karduniaš, they have names ending in aš. He still inclines to connect the Kašda, or Chaldees, with the Kaššu. Mr. Pinches, on the other hand, seeks the origin of the Kaššu in the north-west. "The cuneiform style of writing was in use in early times in Capadocia, and the country around seems to have borne the name of Cush." Thence, in his opinion, the Accadian race, including the Kaššu, emigrated to Babylonia. On the ground of some newly discovered texts, Prof. Delitzsch also deals considerably with the difficult subject of early Babylonian chronology. In the May number of the *Proceedings of Biblical Archæology*, Mr. Pinches also deals with the same subject, on the ground of still more recent discoveries. The two together leave the matter in a very unsatisfactory condition.

By the liberality of Miss C. L. Wolfe, of New York, an American expedition to Babylonia has at last been rendered possible. The main object of the expedition is exploration. One of the members is the Rev. W. H. Ward, D. D., of the *Independent*.

In his *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*, p. 118, Prof. Wellhausen says: "As a lunar festival, undoubtedly the Sabbath also reached back to a great antiquity. Among the Israelites, however, this day acquired a quite peculiar significance,

by which it was distinguished from all other festivals; it became the day of rest κατ' ἐξοχήν. Originally the rest was only a consequence of the festival, etc." With this compare the following from the summing up in Dr. Lotz's *Quaestionum de Historia Sabbati*: "11) Sabbata [apud Babylonios] non erant dies atri sed otii severe quidem imperati, verum minime tristic. 12) Non ad Lunae cultum sabbata principio pertinuerunt. 13) Sunt fortasse ex eo orta, quod numerus senarius Babylonii numerus principalis (*Grundzahl*) mensurarum erat, quare senum dierum laboris quasi plenus videbatur esse laboris modus, quem subsequi diem quietis consentaneum esset. 14) Israelitae Sabbata a Babylonii acceperunt, etc."

Dr. Carl Abel, of Dresden, the well-known Coptic scholar, has in the press a book on the relations between the Japhetic, Semitic and Hamitic families of languages.

W. A. I., vol. V., 2nd part, has appeared. Among its plates is an edition of the "Inscription of Nebuchadnezzar I.," published last year by Dr. H. Hilprecht as "Inaugural-Dissertation" under the title "Freibrief Nebuchadnezzar's I." It is in archaic characters; and, in addition to the original, the editors have, therefore, given us a transcription into the common later Babylonian characters. A similar transcription of this inscription, together with transliteration and translation, the latter differing in some particulars from those of Dr. Hilprecht, were published by Messrs. Pinches and Budge, in the April number of the *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*. Messrs. Pinches and Budge, as well as Dr. Hilprecht, have assigned Nebuchadnezzar I. to the middle of the 12th century B. C. Prof. Friedr. Delitzsch did the same in his *Sprache der Kossäer*, on the ground of the so-called synchronon history in II. R., 65, where a Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon seems to be the cotemporary of Aššurešiši, father of Tiglathpileser I., king of Assyria. In the list of Babylonian kings, published by Mr. Pinches, in the *Proceedings* for May, we find the 12th century filled up from 1175 onward. From 1154 to 1146 ruled a king whose name Mr. Pinches has failed to transliterate. Unless this should turn out to be Nebuchadnezzar, it would seem as though the synchronous history, the list of Babylonian kings, or the Assyriologists had made a mistake. In the July number of the *Andover Review*, Prof. Haupt ascribes to the monarch in question the date 1300 B. C., but does not give his reasons. The above mentioned list also seems to show that the name which Prof. Delitzsch (p. 15) conjectured to be Nabûkudûrusur was Ninipkudûrusur, who reigned in the 10th century B. C. This is important, on account of the ingenious use Prof. Delitzsch made of this conjecture in the work above referred to. Besides Nebuchadnezzar, the most important king affected by the change is Simmas-sigu, whom Delitzsch placed about 1175 B. C., now dated 1003—985.

Among the texts published in the new part of V. R., which have been already described or discussed, in the *Transactions or Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, we notice especially Plates LX. and LXI., a "stone tablet from the temple of the Sun-god at Sippara, containing an inscription of Nabû-bal-iddina." Of this stone there appeared a photo-lithograph, with description and general summary of contents, in *Transactions*, Vol. VIII., Part 2, and in the *Proceedings* for May will be found a further notice of the same.

Plate XLIV. contains the "list of names of ancient Sumerian and Accadian kings," of which Prof. Delitzsch has made such large use in the *Sprache der Kossäer* (cf. pp. 20, 21), and which was discussed by Mr. Pinches, in the *Proceedings* for January, 1881.

The famous Nabonidus cylinder from Sippara, which carried us back to the date 3800, B. C. (Sargon of Akkad), a portion of which was published and discussed in the *Proceedings* for November, 1882, appears as Plate LXIV.

The texts of this latest publication are almost, if not quite, all from the discoveries of Mr. Rassam, and are chiefly Babylonian, in distinction from Assyrian. A new edition of IV. R is now in press.

In the *Independent* of September 4th, Dr. I. H. Hall gives some account of a valuable Syriac MS., belonging to Mr. R. S. Williams, of Utica, N. Y. Its chief value lies in the fact that it contains 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, and Jude. The date of writing is 1471, A. D. The text is in substantial agreement with the "Bodleian manuscript, as reported by Pococke. It is also a little closer to the Greek text of the critical editions than is the text of Pococke." It comes from Further Asia, where it was probably written by a trinitarian Christian; but it is written "in a rather western Syrian hand." It attempts to be critical, and has a number of Syriac and Arabic marginal notes about points, vowels, and the like, "which give the manuscript a high value in linguistic science."

PIRKE ABOTH; or, SAYINGS OF THE FATHERS.

BY REV. B. PICK, PH. D.,

Allegheny, Pa.

Translated from the Hebrew Edition of Prof H. L. Strack, of Berlin, Germany.

[What is included in brackets is by the translator.]

CHAPTER II.

1. Rabbi¹ saith, Which is the right way that a man should choose for himself? All such as is honorable to him who treads therein, and gets him honor from man.² Moreover, be as careful about the performance of a light precept as of a weighty one, because thou canst not estimate the award due to the respective precepts. Compute always the temporal damage sustained by the performance of a duty by its eternal reward, and the temporary gain acquired by transgression by the damage in eternity. Contemplate three things, and thou wilt avoid the occasions for transgressions. Consider what is above thee: an All-seeing eye, and an hearing ear,³ and all thy deeds are written in a book.⁴

2. Rabban Gamaliel,⁵ the son of Rabbi Judah, the prince, said: The study⁶ of the law accords well with worldly pursuits; the twofold occupation causes sin

¹ Rabbi plainly is Rabbi Jehuda ha-nasi, also Rabbenu ha-gadosh, son of Simeon, mentioned i., 18, editor of our Mishna, flourished in the last quarter of the second century, A. D. On him comp. Abr. Krochmal, *Hechaluz* ii., 63-94; A. Bodek, *Marcus Aurelius Antoninus als Zeitgenosse und Freund des Rabbi Jehuda ha-nasi*, Leipz. 1868; S. Gelbhaus, *Rabbi Jehuda Hanasi und die Redaction der Mishna*, Vienna, 1876 (in fact 1880, only to be used with precaution). [Comp. Strack's review in Schuerer's *Theolog. Literaturzeitung*, 1881, No. 3.]

² Phil. iv., 8: καὶ εἰ τις ἐπαινος ταῦτα λογίζεται.

³ Ps. xxxiv., 16, 17; 1 Peter iii., 12.

⁴ Dan. vii., 10. [Comp. Rev. iii., 5; xiii., 8; xx., 12; xxi., 27. Comp. also the word in the *dies Irae*: Liber scriptus proferetur, In quo totum continetur, Unde mundus judicetur].

⁵ [About 210-225 A. D., He was named *Bathraa*, i. e., the "Last," because he terminated the long dynasty of the house of Hillel.]

⁶ Study; so also iv., 13a; vi., 5, 6; different v., 21.

to be forgotten. And all the study of the law, that is not supported by business, will become of none effect, and will be the cause of sin. And whoever is engaged in the service of the congregation ought to act for God's sake; then will the merit¹ of their ancestors support them, and their righteousness endure forever. As for you, I entitle you to great reward as if ye had performed them.

3. Beware of the powers that be, for they do not patronize except for selfish purposes; they appear as friends while men are useful² to them, but they do not stand by a man when he is in distress.

4a. He used to say: Make His (God's) will³ as if it were thine own, that He may make thy will as if it were His will.⁴ Nullify thy will on account of His will,⁵ so that He may nullify the will of others on account of thy will.

4b. Hillel⁶ said: Separate⁷ not thyself from the community; and have no confidence in thyself until the day of thy death; and judge not thy fellow-man until thou art placed in his position;⁸ and utter not a word that is incomprehensible, (under the impression) that it will eventually be comprehensible; and say not, When I shall be at leisure, I shall study; mayhap thou wilt not have leisure.

5. He also said: A boor cannot be fearful of sin, nor can a rustic⁹ be a saint;¹⁰ the bashful¹¹ will not become learned, nor the passionate man a teacher; nor will the engrossed¹² merchant be a sage; and where there are no men, strive¹³ thou to be a man.

6. He having also seen a skull floating on the water, said: "Because thou hast caused others to float, thou hast been floated; and the end of those who floated thee will be that they will be floated."¹⁴

¹ Merit זכות; on זכות comp. F. Weber, *System der altsynagogalen palästinischen Theologie*. Leipz. 1880, chap. 10; on זכות אבות ↑ [i. e., merit of the fathers] especially pp. 280-285.

² הַנֶּאֱדָה use, profit; נִהְנֶה (Niphal of הִנֵּה) iv., 5b, vi., 1, to profit by.

³ [Comp. Matt. vii., 21.]

⁴ [Comp. Matt. xxi., 22.]

⁵ [Comp. 1 John ii., 15, 17. In Xenoph. *Memor.* ii., 1, 28 we read: "Wilt thou have the favor of the gods, serve the gods."]

⁶ With Hillel's maxims § 4b-7 (others, see above i., 12-14), the traditional chain is again taken up, which was interrupted by the inserted sentences of men from the house of Hillel (i., 16-2, 4a).

⁷ פָּרַשׁ to separate. Heb. x., 25 μὴ ἐγκαταλείποντες κτλ. [Dean Stanley quotes Ewald as saying on this maxim: "Separate not... death." "This," Ewald remarks, "is a strange truth for a Pharisee to have uttered; one which, had the Pharisees followed, no Pharisee would have ever arisen. Yet," he adds, with true appreciation of the elevation of the best spirits above their party, "it is not the only example of a distinguished teacher protesting against the fundamental error of his own peculiar tendencies."]

⁸ [Comp. Ecclus. xi., 7: Blame not before thou hast examined; think over first, and then rebuke.]

⁹ עַם הָאָרֶץ (an expression already occurring Ezek. vii., 27, though not in that same signification) denotes the great mass devoid of the knowledge of the law, John vii., 49: ὁ ὄχλος οὗτος ὁ μὴ γινώσκων τὸν νόμον. Here, as in other passages, e. g. v., 10, an individual is meant [comp. גֵּי = gentile], then plur. עַמֵּי הָאָרֶץ iii., 10b. Observe the special prominence which is attached to the intellectual above the ethical.

¹⁰ Only a seeming contradiction with *Shabbath*, fol. 63, col. 1, towards the end: [when the rustic is a saint] live not in his neighborhood.

¹¹ Bashful, here: he that is ashamed of putting a question.

¹² כְּחוֹרֶה also vi., 5 traffic) cf. Ezek. xxvii., 15), comp. *Erubin* fol. 55, col. 1, where it is said on Deut. xxx., 13: Rabbi Jochanan said: לֹא בַשָּׁמַיִם [not in heaven], the law is not found among the high-minded; [neither is it beyond the sea], neither is it found among the merchants. [Comp. also Ecclus. xxvi., 29: "A merchant will hardly keep himself free from doing wrong, and a huckster will not be declared free from sin."]

¹³ The same maxim is given in the Aramaic *Berathoth*, fol. 63, col. 1.

¹⁴ Comp. *Sota* i., 7: "With the measure ye mete, it shall be measured unto you," and Hillel's dictum *Shabbath*, fol. 31, col. 1: "What is hateful to you, do not unto thy neighbor."

7. He also said: He who increases flesh increases worms; he who increases riches, increases cares; he who increases wives, increases witchcraft; he who increases maid-servants, increases lewdness; he who increases men-servants, increases robbery; he who increases his knowledge of the law, increases life; he who increases his study in college, increases wisdom; he who increases counsel, increases prudence; he who increases justice, increases peace; if a man has gained a good name, he has gained it for himself; if he has gained the words of the law, he has gained for himself eternal life.

8a.¹ Rabban Jochanan,² the son of Zaccai, received the tradition from Hillel and Shammai. He used to say: If thou hast studied the law much, do not consider it as a good deed on thy part, since thou wast created for that very purpose.³

8b. Rabban Jochanan, the son of Zaccai, had five disciples, and these are they; Rabbi Eliezer, the son of Hyrkanos,⁴ Rabbi Joshua, the son of Hananya, Rabbi José, the priest, Rabbi Simeon, the son of Nathanael, and Rabbi Eleazar, the son of Arach. He thus estimated their worth: Rabbi Eliezer, the son of Hyrkanos, is as a well-plastered cistern, which loses not a drop; Joshua, son of Hananya, happy are his parents; R. José, the priest, is a saint; R. Simeon, the son of Nathanael, fears sin; and Rabbi Eleazar, the son of Arach, is an ever-flowing spring. He used to say: If all the sages of Israel were in one scale of the balance, and R. Eliezer, the son of Hyrcanos, in the other, he would outweigh them all. Abba Saul⁵ said, in his name: If all the sages of Israel were in one scale, and Eliezer, the son of Hyrcanos, with them, and Eleazar, the son of Arach, in the other, he would outweigh them all.

9. He said to them: Go forth and consider which is the good path to which a man should cleave. Rabbi Eliezer said; A good eye;⁶ Rabbi Joshua said, A good comrade; Rabbi José said, A good neighbor; Rabbi Simeon said, One who perceives the future; Rabbi Eleazar said, A good heart.⁷ He said to them: I prefer the words of Eleazar, the son of Arach, to your words; as his words include yours. He also said to them: Go forth and consider which is the bad way⁸ that man should shun. Rabbi Eliezer said: a bad eye⁹; Rabbi Joshua said: A bad comrade; Rabbi José said, A bad neighbor; Rabbi Simeon said, The borrower who does not repay, for when one borrows from man, it is as if he borrows from God,¹⁰ for it is said: "The wicked borroweth and payeth not again; but the

¹ Continuation to i., 15.

² A disciple of Hillel; according to *Rosh ha-shana*, fol. 31 col. 2, he became 120 years old, the same age—the Mosaic—which was ascribed to Hillel and R. Agiba.

³ Comp. Luke xvii., 10; 1 Cor. ix., 16.

⁴ Ὑρκανός. The meaning of this name, which already occurs in the second century B. C. (John Hyrcanus, 135-105) is not yet ascertained.

⁵ In the first half of the second century A. D.

⁶ According to v., 19, the disciples of Abraham have "a good eye," those of Balaam "a bad eye." Comp. also Prov. xxii., 9 [and Matt. vi., 22].

⁷ [i. e., susceptible of every good, comp. Matt. v., 8; Luke vi., 45.]

⁸ [i. e. the way which leads to destruction. In the Scriptures חֹשֶׁךְ means often "darkness," for the evil one likes the darkness. Thus Prov. ii., 13: "who leave the paths of uprightness to walk in the way of darkness;" comp. also 2 Peter ii., 15.]

⁹ [the eye is the mirror of the soul, comp. Matt. vi., 23.] רָעָה means to be envious, malicious.

¹⁰ [Literally, "place," which is often used in Jewish writings for God, because there is no place which is not pervaded by His presence. Philo *de somn.* says: ὁ θεὸς καλεῖται τόπος τῷ περιερχεῖν, κτλ.]

righteous showeth mercy and giveth."¹ Rabbi Eleazar said : a bad heart.² He said to them : I prefer the words of Eleazer, the son of Arach, to your words, as his words include yours.

10. They³ also said three things : Rabbi Eliezer⁴ said : Let the honor of thy companion be as dear to thee as thine own ; and be not easily provoked, and repent one day⁵ before thy death, and⁶ warm thyself by the fire of the sages, and be careful that their coal does not burn thee, for their bite is as the bite of a jackal, and their sting like the sting of a scorpion; and their burn is the burn of a fiery serpent, and all their words are as fiery coals.

11. Rabbi Joshua said : The bad eye, the bad thought⁷ and misanthropy draw man out of the world.⁸

12. Rabbi José said : Let the property of thy companion be as dear to thee as thine own, and prepare thyself to study the law, for it will not be bequeathed to thee by inheritance ;⁹ and let all thy deeds be to promote the name of God.¹⁰

13. Rabbi Simeon said : Be careful of reading the Shema¹¹ and the Prayer ;¹² and when thou prayest consider not thy prayer as fixed,¹³ but pray for mercy and supplicate for grace in the presence of God, "for he is gracious and merciful, slow to anger, and abundant in mercy, and repenteth him of the evil,"¹⁴ and be not impious in thine own sight.

14. Rabbi Eleazar said : Be diligent to study the law, and consider what thou mayest rejoin to an epicurean,¹⁵ and consider also for whom thou workest, and who is thy employer,¹⁶ who is to pay the wages for thy labor.

15. Rabbi Tarphon¹⁷ said : The day is short,¹⁸ and the labor vast,¹⁹ but the

¹ Ps. xxxvii., 21.

² Mark vii., 21, 22.

³ Each of them.

⁴ Comp. C. A. R. Toettermann, *R. Eliezer ben Hyrcanos sive de vi qua doctrina Christiana primis seculis illustrissimos quosdam Iudaeorum attraxit*. Leipzig, 1877 (comp. *Theol. Literaturzeitung* 1877, col. 687—689).

⁵ One day, i. e. to-day, since you may die to-morrow, *Shabbath*, fol. 153, col. 1. Comp. Hillel's words, I. 14 and II. 4b toward the end.

⁶ The words "and . . . fiery coals" probably a later addition, comp. Aboth Rabbi Nathan.

⁷ There are two inclinations in man, a good and an evil one. The good is to conquer the evil, and can do so, according to Jewish teaching. Comp. Weber, *Altsyn. Theol.* esp. p. 208 sq., 221 sq. The evil inclination is also called *צַר* without addition, see *Aboth*, IV., 1.

⁸ "Draw out of the world," refers here, III., 10b and IV., 21, to the physical life. Comp. *Prov.* xiv., 30.

⁹ Comp. *Deut.* xxxiii., 4.

¹⁰ [Comp. 1 *Cor.* x., 31.]

¹¹ The prayer, which every grown-up male Israelite (excepting women, children and slaves) has to recite twice every day (in the morning and in the evening). It contains the three sections of the law, *Deut.* vi., 4-9, xi., 13-21; *Num.* xv., 37-41, and bears its name from the first word *שמע*. [Comp. also Pick, art. *Shema* in McClintock and Strong's *Cyclop.*]

¹² [It is the eighteen benedictions or *Shemoneh Esreh*. Comp. Pick, art. *Shemoneh Esreh* in McClintock and Strong, l. c.]

¹³ Comp. *Berachoth* IV., 4, where we read as R. Eliezer's word: "If one makes his prayer fixed, his prayer is not supplications."

¹⁴ *Joel* ii., 13.

¹⁵ Freethinker, i. e., the non-Israelitish freethinker, according to *Sanhedrin*, fol. 39, col. 2.

¹⁶ God, see § 16.

¹⁷ *Τριφων*, a contemporary of the five disciples of Jochanan, often mentioned as the opponent of Agiba. [Some maintained that he is the same Trypho, who is the interlocutor in Justin Martyr's *Dialogue*. Comp. Pick, art. *Tarphon* in McClintock and Strong's *Cyclop.*]

¹⁸ [Comp. *John* ix., 4.]

¹⁹ [Comp. *ibid.* iv., 35.]

laborers are indolent,¹ though the wages be large and the master of the house² is pressing.

16. He used to say : It is not incumbent upon thee to finish the work,³ and yet thou art not at liberty to be idle about it.⁴ If thou hast studied the law much, great reward will be given thee ; for faithful is thy employer, who will award to thee the hire of thy labor ;⁵ but know that the reward of the righteous is in the future.

➤CONTRIBUTED➤NOTES.◀

Remarks on the Ethiopic.—That a magazine which is devoted to the interests of Hebrew study, which looks at the language of the Old Testament rather from a philological standpoint than as the medium of pre-Christian revelation, should not pass by unnoticed the claims of the cognate tongues, will probably be accepted without debate. Indeed it is one of the objects of *HEBRAICA* to encourage such discussions. Accordingly the language and literature of Ethiopia, “the Switzerland of Africa,” have a right to a hearing in its columns from time to time. And this they richly merit. Both the character of the Ethiopic language, in that it has worked out the common Semitic genius in its own peculiar way, and thus contributes its portion to the solution of the problems of this group of languages, as also the large literature which is treasured up in this language, are well worthy of study. Ethiopic is not a mere twig from some larger limb, not a mere dialect of which only fragmentary remains or a few enigmatical inscriptions have been preserved ; but possessing an extensive literature, it has a complete grammar and a full lexicon, and thus offers ample material for wide research.

It is not a matter of difficulty to assign to this language its position in the Semitic group. Geographical reasons point to a closer affinity between the Ethiopic and the Arabic, an affinity which would appear all the closer from the historical reason that both languages about the same time became the vehicles of an extensive literature, and that they thus would have reached about the same stage of development. Of course this latter feature, in consideration of the well known conservatism of the Semitic languages, as this is apparent, e. g., in the virtually uniform character of Biblical Hebrew and in the primitive character of the Arabic, would seem of little moment, yet for the purpose of comparing the two languages it has its importance. An examination of the language shows that what history and geography suggest is correct. The Ethiopic language belongs to the Southern Semitic group, of which the Arabic is the representative and most important member. This connection is evident e. g. in the partition of 𐩌 and 𐩍 into two letters of different intensity (like the Arabic ح and خ for 𐤇, and ص and ض for 𐤄 although it no longer splits the 𐤇, 𐤆, 𐤅 and 𐤃 into two each, as is the

¹ [Comp. Matt. ix., 37, 38.]

² God [*οικοδεσπότης*, Matt. xx. 1].

³ [Comp. Rom. xii., 4, 5.]

⁴ [Comp. Matt. xx., 6.]

⁵ [Comp. *ibid.* xx., 8, 9.]

case in Arabic, but in the room thereof has developed an emphatic *p* sound and a number of *u*-containing gutturals and palatals); further, in the frequency of the short vowels at the end of words, in the wealth of verbal forms, making use of every possibility offered in this connection, and thus producing twelve regular and full conjugations of the triliteral verb; in the large number of verb roots of four and more letters; in the inner, or broken and collective plural and formatonis; in the regular accusative; in the separating of the subjunctive and voluntative from the imperfect; in the possibility of suffixing two personal pronouns to a single verb, and in a number of other less important grammatical peculiarities. In the lexicon the relation is equally close and apparent. The *copia verborum* indeed contains quite a number of what are probably African vocables, or at least can as yet not be explained from a Semitic basis, but yet the great mass of words and meanings are the same as in Arabic; and in many cases where the latter has developed roots and significations of its own, not found in the North Semitic branch, the Ethiopic has the same peculiarities as its southern neighbor. One very marked feature of the Ethiopic language is its syntax. The Arabic has surpassed exceedingly the stiff and stereotyped character of Hebrew and Syriac syntax, but the pliability of the Arabic is nothing compared with the elegance and variety of the grammatical structure of the Ethiopic. The latter language, probably because its literature was nourished under Greek example and Greek incitement, has a fineness of syntax unequalled by any other of its sister Semitic languages, and yet it cannot be said that any of its syntactical features are unnatural or un-Semitic. While the Greek may have furnished the models and idea, the syntax of the Ethiopic grammar exhibits only the development of what is contained in germ in the structure of the other languages, partly in the Arabic and partly in the North Semitic.

And yet the Ethiopic is by no means merely a dialect of the Arabic. Already the fact that many of the words for the most common objects in existence and for the most frequently occurring acts are in Ethiopic not the same as those used in Arabic, shows that at a comparatively early period the Ethiopic language entered upon a development of its own. Its vowels are not so abundant, *ä* and *ë* being its only short vowels; its nominal and adjective formations are not as varied and numerous; its prepositions and conjunctions are nearly all peculiar; it has no diminutive or relative forms, and no genitive; its alphabet is syllabic and reads from left to right, although this is a later development, the older inscriptions still showing the *βουστροφῆδόν* style, and thus pointing to an original method from right to left. And while a number of facts seem to show that the language of Ethiopia occupied an independent position over against the Arabic, which was the classical tongue at least of Northern and Middle Arabia, whatever its nearer relation may have been to the comparatively unknown but nearer languages of Southern Arabia; a number of other facts, both in grammar and lexicon, point to a closer connection with the North Semitic languages, or, rather, indicate that the Ethiopic retained and developed some features of the one original and undivided Semitic tongue which the northern branch also developed, but which the Arabic did not develop, or at any rate dropped. Still another class of peculiarities show that in the Ethiopic the process of decay had already commenced when it became a literary language. All these features combined will aid in giving the language its proper position as a branch, but one marked by individuality in character and development, of the Semitic family.

The Ethiopians call their tongue "lezâna Geëz," the language of the free. Originally it was the language spoken in Tigre, a district in the northern part of Ethiopia; but when a powerful government was established at Uxum, the capital of Tigre, and spread over the rest of the country, the language of the district became the language of the country. This is a phenomenon often observed in history. The Arabic of the Koran and of literature was originally the dialect of the tribe Kinânâ, to which the Kuraisch family, of which Mohammed was a member, belonged. With the conquests of the new religion it spread also. In the Germany of the reformation period a similar transformation took place through Luther's Bible and other writings. Although the alphabet and beginnings of Ethiopic literature cannot be ascribed to Christian influences, as is proved from the fact that these old inscriptions date back to pre-Christian days and convey sentiments decidedly heathenish, yet the literature of the language as such is entirely of a Christian and ecclesiastical sort. And to the present day, although the Amharic and other dialects have supplanted it in the mouths of the people, and even the priests and educated people understand but little of it, it continues to be used in the services of the Church as the *lingua sacra*.

At the head of Ethiopic literature stands the version or versions of the Bible; and with these words the two chief characteristics of this literature have been expressed—it is κατ' ἐξοχήν churchly, and a literature of translations partly from the Greek and partly from the Arabic. The position here assigned to the Ethiopic translation of the Bible is based not only or chiefly on chronological grounds, but rather on the fact that this translation gave character and form to all the literature that followed. Dillmann, the greatest of Ethiopic scholars, in the Prolegomena to his Lexicon, says, "Inter ea (i. e. Ethiopic literature) primum locum obtinent Biblia Æthiopica, quæ omnium literarum Abyssiniarum fundamentum sunt et norma, et quam reliqui scriptores suum dicendi scribendique genus conformaverunt." These words in nowise overestimate the importance or influence of this version for the literary life of Ethiopia. This translation made from the Septuagint soon after the Christianization of Ethiopia, is a fair and reliable one, and should be heard in settling one of the vexed questions of old Testament Science, viz., the text of the LXX. As yet the whole Old Testament has not been published. In 1701 Job Ludolph published the Psalms, and in 1853 Dillmann issued a critical edition of the Octateuchus (i. e. the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges and Ruth) and of 1 and 2 Kings, and lately also of the prophet Joel. The New Testament was published in Rome as early as 1548 by the Abyssinian Tesfa-Zion, which version was received into the great London Polyglot Bible, and in 1830 Th. P. Platt issued an edition for the British Bible Society; but neither of these can be called critical. About the same time with the Bible, or soon after, a number of other books were translated, which, owing to the vague ideas of Biblical canon among the Ethiopians are sometimes found among the canonically received books. Fortunately a large number of these translations are of works of which the originals have been lost, and in this case the translations have a greater than the mere literary value of aiding in determining or understanding the original texts. A number of Pseudepographi of the Old Testament have thus been preserved to the church. Without doubt the chief of these is the enigmatical Book of Enoch, of which a new translation, with extensive introduction and notes, by the writer appeared at Andover in 1882. Dillmann has published the Ethiopic text and a German translation. Allied in spirit to Enoch is the haggadistic production

called the Kufale, or the Book of Jubilees, or also the Smaller Genesis, *ⲕⲏ ⲗⲉⲡⲧⲏ γένεσις*, in which the contents of Genesis are reproduced under the scheme of Jubilee periods, and filled out with all kinds of rabbinical stories. Dillmann published the Ethiopic texts in 1859 and a German translation in the *Goettinger Gelehrter Anzeiger*, but no English translation has as yet been made. Other works of this kind, well known through the patristic citations, are the *Ascensio Isaiae* and the Apocalypse of Ezra. The Ethiopic text of the former was published by Dillmann in 1876, and of the latter by Platt in 1820. A most peculiar work is the *Physiologus*, the representative of a strange class of Christian literature in the early middle ages, in which the objects of nature are used to teach and illustrate Christian doctrine and morality, and of this Hommel edited the Ethiopic text and made a German translation in 1877. The latest work of this kind issued is the contest of Adam, edited in Ethiopic by Trumpp, and translated into English by Malan. The literature is also rich in liturgical work, of which, however, but little has been translated. Trumpp in 1878 published the Ethiopic Baptismal Book of which the present writer soon after made a translation in the *Luthern Quarterly*, Gettysburg, Pa.; and Rodwell, in 1864 and 1867, published in London, chiefly from MSS., a large collection of Ethiopic Prayers and Liturgies. Some few works are extant on other subjects, such as exegesis, mostly translations from Chrysostom; a collection of Monastic commands called the Rules of Pachominy; confessions of faith, both of the Church as a whole and of prominent individuals; and one or two works on philosophy, law and medicine. The ascetic literature, as can be expected, is very large, the lives of the saints being described *in extenso*. The Ethiopic almanac has a saint for every day, and a biography of every saint. Wüstenfeld recently published a German translation of this saints' biographical calendar, called the *Synaxarium*. Poetry also is to be found, but it has stood in the service of the Church, consisting chiefly of antiphones, prayers and laudations of Mary and the saints. A kind of a *Specilegium Æthiopice* in English translation was given by the writer in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* of January 1882. Of course we have not given here anything like a complete list of Ethiopic works, not even of all that have been published, but have endeavored to furnish only enough material for readers to form a judgment as to the character and scope of this literature.

The facilities for studying Ethiopic are very good for any one who understands German, but very poor for a person who does not. And this is nearly all the work of a single man, Professor A. Dillmann, of Berlin, a pupil of Ewald. It is true that before his day we had the grammar and lexicon of that enthusiastic scholar Job Ludolf, the author of the very valuable *Historie Æthiopica* and the accompanying *Commentarius in Hist. Æthiop.*; but Dillmann's work threw all this into the shade. His *Grammatik*, *Lexicon Æthiopic Latinum* and *Chrestomathia Æthiopica* offer not only the beginner, but also the advanced student vast material for work. They are all the fruit of ripe scholarship, written upon the solid basis of comparative Semitic philology, and will repay study. Other aids also are at hand. Schrader, the well known Assyrian scholar, has written a well digested and careful treatise on the relation of the Ethiopic to the other Semitic tongues, entitled "*De Linguae Æthiopicae Cum Conatis Linguis Comparatae Indole Universae*;" Stade, now Professor in Giessen and the author of a new and excellent Hebrew Grammar, wrote a dissertation on the pluraliter stems in Ethiopic; Hommel has made some contributions to the Ethiopic lexicon in his *Physiologus* and his

Namen der Längethieres beiden Suedsemit. Völkern; Trumpp has also done something in this direction in his various contributions to Ethiopic; König, the author of the new Hebrew grammar based on Qimḥi, has published two series of studies on the alphabet, pronunciation and forms of the Ethiopic language, and others have done similar work. From this last, which of course is by no means exhaustive, it is apparent that there is plenty of material at the disposal of scholars for both the critical and the literary study of the Ethiopic language. It is only to be regretted that so few find inclination and time to devote more attention to this interesting subject.

G. H. S.

Kautzsch's Aramaic Grammar.—This work deserves special commendation from the fact that the author has restricted himself to the Aramaic as presented in the Old Testament, and that he did neither intend, nor pretend, as some others before him have done, to write a grammar of the Aramaic in general. The Aramaic dialects, as we have them preserved in Daniel and Ezra, in the various Targums, in the two Talmuds, in the Midrashic and in some other branches of the ancient Jewish literature, differ very considerably, grammatically as well as lexically. In time and in place the remains of the Aramaic literature lie almost as widely asunder as the writings of Chaucer and of Macaulay, as the Scotch dialect and that of Wales. Could we now reasonably expect that one grammar of the English language should give us at the same time the rules governing modern English and old English, the English of Northumberland and the English of Sussex County? Any attempt to do so, would result in our confounding one dialect with another, and would be misleading.

So we find in some of the Aramaic dialects the verb **חָמָא** (*to see*), while in others only **חָזָא** is used. In some, *water* is designated by the noun **מַיִן**, in others by **מַיִין**, or **מֵיָא**. In some the plural of masculine nouns ends in **ִין**, in others the ending is **ִין**, com. **גַּבְרִין** and **גַּבְרִין** (*men*). In some the 1 p. Sing. Perf. of the verb ends in **ִית**, in others in **ִין**, comp. **אֶמְרִית** and **אֶמְרִי** (*I have said*), **חָזִית** and **חָזִיא** (*I have seen*). And thus there are hundreds of differences to be found.

Facts enough are recorded proving that even in Judea the dialect of the neighboring Galilee was understood with difficulty in the Talmudic age, and *vice versa*. In Talmud Babyl. Erubhin 53^b, for instance, we find several anecdotes showing this. For example: A Galilean had come to Judea, and there he asked, Who has an **אֶמֶר**? Who has an **אֶמֶר**? And they answered him, Thou foolish Galilean, what dost thou desire with thy **אֶמֶר**? Dost thou mean a **חֲמֹר** (*donkey*) to ride upon, or **חֲמֶר** (*wine*) to drink, or **עֲמֶר** (*wool*) to clothe thyself with, or **אֵמֶר** (*a lamb*) to kill it? In Genesis Rabba, chap. xxiv., Rabbi Eliezer is quoted as having made the remark that in Galilee they say **עֵיִיא** instead of **חֵיִיא** (*serpent*). If such grammatical and lexical differences were prevailing in the speech of the inhabitants of Southern and of Northern Palestine, how still more marked must have been the difference between the Eastern Aramaic spoken in the Euphrates valley and the Western Aramaic spoken on the shores of the lake of Genesareth?

On page 16 of his grammar, Prof. Kautzsch gives a specimen of the Aramaic as still spoken in three villages on the eastern slope of the Anti-Lebanon mount-

ain. If from this short specimen we would be justified in determining the characteristics of the Aramaic as still living in the mouths of a few hundred Syrians of the present day, we might say that in that dialect even radical letters are often dropped. For אחונה (*brother*) they say חונה, for הות (*it was*) they say ות. The same peculiarity we find in the old Aramaic literature, especially in the Jerusalem Talmud, where for אנן (*we*) the form נן appears, for אמר (*to speak*) the form מר, for the proper noun אלעזר the shortened form לעזר, and so forth.

In § 5, No. 3 of his book, Prof. Kautzsch says that we are still lacking a good critical edition of the Targum, both in regard to the consonant-text and to the vocalization thereof. This complaint has now happily become groundless, at least in part. For within a few months, A. Berliner's excellent edition of the Onkelos Targum has left the press (Berlin, 1884), accompanied by notes, introduction, and indexes,—an edition which will satisfy the demands of every student.

B. FELSENTHAL.

The Study of Arabic in the University of Cincinnati.—The study of Arabic has been carried on in the University of Cincinnati for more than five years. The whole number of students that have taken it as a part of their curriculum, amounts to twelve or thirteen. The course, as laid down in the catalogue, is one of two years, but in many instances students have given four or five years to Arabic, making it a main or a secondary branch in a post-graduate course. The authorities of the Hebrew Union College strongly urge those under their charge to engage in the study thereof as long as possible.

At first the students were supplied by the instructor with different books in Arabic, by which aids they were taught to read the text. By means of dictation, paradigms and a vocabulary were acquired, and this was followed by the translation of simple sentences from Arabic into English and vice versa. A knowledge of the most common rules of Syntax was imparted in the same way. The students then took up Wright's Arabic Grammar and Arnold's Chrestomathy, omitting much in the former as being unnecessary. At least two thirds of the Chrestomathy were read, and it was succeeded by the Muallakat, with commentary (Arnold's edition). There was some doubt about the expediency of laying before young students a text so difficult. It was very hard, for a while; but in a short time, there were very few passages that they could not translate. There were four of the Muallakat read.

The last book that is given to the students is the Koran, with Beidhawis' Commentary (Fleischer's edition). The most important Suras with commentary are selected, translated, and the commentary pointed. It is best to accustom students very early to unpointed text. They will not find it, by any means, so difficult as they would think.

Every other year a course of lectures is given on the Semitic languages. These are more of an encyclopedic than philological nature.

Hebrew is not taught in the University of Cincinnati, on account of the advantages offered by the Hebrew Union College. Nearly all of the students that take Arabic have already received instruction in Hebrew, Chaldee and Syriac. The University of Cincinnati has not yet any professor that devotes his time exclusively to teaching the Semitic languages. It will, without doubt, not be very long before such a chair has been established.

One great hindrance to the study of Arabic is the cost of books, and, it might even be added, the lack of the right kind of books at any cost. There is not one grammar that gives, in a succinct and clear form, such an insight into Arabic as is furnished by fifty Latin, or Greek grammars to those wishing to pursue either of these languages.

W. SPROULL.

עֵדֶן—“Eden” (Heb. עֵדֶן) had originally nothing to do with עֵדֶן, pl. עֵדֶיִם. The Hebrews received the word (meaning “field,” “plain”) from the Babylonians. The usual Assyrian ideograph for “field,” “Steppe,” “plain,” is explained in the syllabaries (vid. *Haupt*, ASK, 18, No. 312) by i-di-n u, i. e., עֵדֶן, and as this word appears, at the same time, in the left column of the syllabary (as i-di-in), it may be supposed that it was an old (*uralt*es), non-Semitic word, which later passed over into the Semitic (Del.). Eden, as used by the Hebrew writer, is, of course, a *proper name*, which the Hebrews, as often happens in such cases, interpreted after their own etymology, and which they probably connected with עֵדֶן in the meaning “joy,” “pleasure.”—In this “field” Jahveh planted a “garden,” in which he placed the man. The ideograph in Assyrian for the conception “garden,” read kar and gan, is explained, as regards its meaning in the syllabaries (vid. III., R, 70, 96; ASK, 15, 217) by Assyr. gin û (g-i-nu-u), Accad. ga-na, and, aside from this, it is, for the Assyrian, made clear through i k-lu, i. e., חֲקֵל, “field.” It must remain undecided whether this word which is found in *all* the Semitic languages, also in the Ethiopic, is to be regarded as non-Semitic, but Sumero-Accadian (*Sayce*, *Haupt*, Del.), i. e., as a foreign word in these languages, as “Park” in ours. The possibility that this word passed from the Semitic into the Accadian is, in our opinion, equally as probable, because (vid. F. Del. PD. 135) the proper and, at all events, older word for “garden,” in the Accadian, seems to have been kar; gun, gin replaced kar, as far as we now see, for the first in the time of Asurbanipal (Assurb. *Smith*, 183). The etymology of the word is also, to say the least, made no less satisfactory by the acceptance of its Semitic origin than by the acceptance of its coming out of the Accadian.—*Schrader's KAT.*²

R. F.

חֲדָקָל (Gen. II., 14), the Hebrew name of the Tigris, occurring also in Dan. x., 4. Noteworthy, as is known, is the pronunciation with prefixed h i, which we meet neither in the Aramaic, nor in the Arabic, nor, finally, in the Persian form of the name. It is, however, not specifically Hebraic. It is found also in the Assyrian, but not, however, in the usual texts; these also present only the form “Diglat,” e. g., the Behistun (l. c.) inscription, Babyl. text l. 35 (Di-ig-lat). We meet it, however, in the more complete syllabaries. One of these (II. Rawl. 50, 7) explains the ideograph in Beh. 34, and known to represent the Tigris (BAR.TIK.KAR) by I-di-ig-lat, i. e., as the syllables a, i, u, in the Assyrian represent also ha, hi, hu, = Hidiglat, a form which, as proposed, corresponds very nearly to the Hebrew pronunciation, and joins itself with the Samaritan חֲדָקָל. The hardening of h(i) to h(i), in transfer from one language to another, is, in general, not infrequent. As the Persian A h u r a m a z d â, in the inscription of N a k s c h - i - R u s t a m, certainly became the Babylonian A h u r m a z d a' (together with U r i m i z d a or U r a m a z d a, also U r i m i z d a' of the Behistun inscription), and as the same probably holds good in the Assyrian

itself in the case of the foreign names *Hamattu* and *Amattu* "Hamâth," *Ha-mîdi* and *Amîdi* "Amid," so it is also probable that this Assyrian and Aramaic דקל (ח) is only hardened in pronunciation from an original דקל (ה)—and that the pronunciation with ק goes back to a still earlier form with ג. Probably the matter stands thus, that *Idiglat*, especially *Diglat* (the latter in the Behistun inscription) was the weaker *Babylonian* pronunciation, as reflected in the Persian *Tigrâ*, and as retained to the present day in the Arabic دجلة, while, in the Hebrew and (cf. ܕܩܠ) Aramaic, the specifically *Assyrian* pronunciation received precedence. In other cases it is also known that, in Assyrian, a hard, emphatic ק corresponds to a weak ג in the Babylonian, and that, in still other respects, differences exist between the Assyrian and Babylonian pronunciations, is no less well known. Worthy of notice is the rejection of the fem. ending (a,t) in the Hebrew and Aramaic; while the Assyrian and the other languages mentioned above, including the Neo-Persian, have constantly retained it. Cf. the reverse in the Assyrian-Himjaritic-Aramaic עשר, עשר, עשר, in contrast with the Hebrew-Canaanitic עשרה.—*Schrader's KAT.*²

R. F.

➤EDITORIAL:NOTES.◀

The Study of Assyrian.—The impression prevails that, unless one has a life-time to devote to it, little can be accomplished in the study of Assyrian. This impression is a mistaken one. It is true, of course, that one's entire life might profitably be devoted to the study; that, to become recognized as an authority in Assyrian, one must give himself up exclusively to this and kindred subjects. But are we to take it for granted that, unless a man is to become a *specialist* in a given department, there is nothing in connection with that department which he may profitably study? Shall no man study Latin except the prospective professor of Latin?

It is probable that the difficulties of Assyrian study have been exaggerated. Or, perhaps the statement may better be made thus: The difficulties which originally existed,—and, it must be conceded, they seemed almost insuperable,—thanks to the arduous labors of such men as Delitzsch, Schrader, Oppert, Sayce, are now largely removed. Difficulties, to be sure, still remain; but, compared with those which have been overcome, they are of a minor character. The greatest difficulty for the student is the mastery of the syllabary, now that it has been quite definitely determined. But we think that an important and helpful step in advance was made during the past summer, when it was decided by an eminent Assyriologist—a practical instructor—that it was expedient, first to get some knowledge of the language through transliterated texts, and then, gradually to master the signs. This method has two advantages: it will encourage the student; and it will enable him to acquire the syllabary all the more rapidly and thoroughly, because he will know the meaning and signification of the roots and formative elements for which the signs stand.

The adoption of this method will induce five men to take up Assyrian where, otherwise, one would have hesitated. Nor need we fear that men will not learn the syllabary, after having gained some knowledge of the language. Surely that

which he would earlier have been compelled to do, will now be done all the more willingly; for not only will the student find it more easy, but he will be more fully persuaded of its importance.

The question arises: For whom is a study of Assyrian important? Whom will it pay? We answer:

1) *The professors of Hebrew.* We cannot understand how any one whose business it is to instruct in Hebrew, or to teach the Old Testament, can well afford to be without some knowledge, at least, of that language and literature which has already affected so largely the very questions which he is called upon daily to discuss in the class-room, viz., the forms of Hebrew words, the meaning of Hebrew words, the history of a nation so closely connected with that of Israel. The example of a learned professor of Hebrew, nearly sixty years of age, in a Southern seminary, who has spent his vacation, just closing, in the class-room study of Assyrian, because, indeed, he felt that a knowledge of this language was necessary to fit him for the better performance of his duties as a professor of Hebrew,—the example of this man deserves to be imitated by younger men. There is much time spent in these days by our theological professors in the discussion of questions which are of no possible moment, however they may be settled. Why not devote a portion of this time to the study of Assyrian? We profess to follow the historico-grammatical method in our interpretation of Scripture. Are there any questions then so fundamental as questions of grammar, of lexicography, of history? Is there any one source from which so much aid may be gained as from Assyrian?

2) *Ministers who know Hebrew.* There are some clergymen, let us thank God, who are familiar with Hebrew, who read the Hebrew of the Old Testament, as they read the Greek of the New. These, as compared in number with those who do not possess this knowledge, are, it must be confessed, few. But they are growing more numerous. Ten years ago they might be counted by tens. To-day they may be counted perhaps by hundreds. For this class of men, we can think of no more profitable linguistic study. Even a slight knowledge of Assyrian will enliven their Hebrew, and make it again as fresh as when first learned. Besides, who ought to be more fully equipped for the study of the Divine Word than the minister? Not even the specialist. If the Assyrian language and history will assist one in understanding the Hebrew language and history, shall it not be studied?

3) *Students of Ancient History and of Comparative Religions.* The discoveries in Assyria have opened a new field in Ancient History. What student in this department or in that of Comparative Religions,—now a science in itself,—can well afford to be ignorant of a language, of a literature, and of a history which promise so much to the investigator. Nor need one suppose that he can understand the history or religion of a people, any more than its literature, without an acquaintance with its language. The greatest of all Hebrew historians, Ewald, was likewise the greatest of all Hebrew scholars.

It is objected, *first*, that the books for the study of Assyrian are very expensive. This is true; but what library is worthy of the name that has not an Assyrian apparatus? and, besides, what are a few dollars in a matter of this kind. It may not be long, perhaps, until we shall have Assyrian text-books prepared by American professors, and then the objection of expense will no longer exist.

It is objected, *secondly*, that it is impossible to obtain instruction. This was

true three years ago, but is no longer true. At Cambridge, Professor D. G. Lyon has classes in Assyrian; in New York City, Professor Francis R. Brown; in Philadelphia, Professor John P. Peters; in Baltimore, Professor Paul Haupt. There was, during the past summer, and there will also be, the coming summer, an opportunity for gaining this instruction. Shall all this kind of work be done in Germany? Shall not American scholars show that they have a deep interest in whatever concerns the Word of God, or the language in which that Word is written?

Unaccented Open Syllables with a Short Vowel.—With Professor Strack's admirable treatment of "Syllables in Hebrew" the discussion in *HEBRAICA* of the so-called "Intermediate" Syllable will close. We regret that we cannot take space for the publication of other articles on this subject which have been received.

In closing the discussion, a few words may be regarded as in place:—

From the lack of a clear treatment of this subject by grammarians, and from the opinions of eminent teachers expressed orally and by letter to the writer, it is inferred that the subject is one not deemed worthy of attention. But what are the facts?

1) The Hebrew vowel-system, "while not authentic, and by no means to be regarded as an intrinsic part of the text," is not merely valuable, but indeed *necessary*, as an aid in learning the language. No accurate knowledge of the Hebrew can be obtained aside from an absolute mastery of the principles of the Massoretic system of punctuation, whether these be regarded as natural or artificial, real or imaginary. And the regularity of the system is all the more a reason why seeming departures from it should be closely examined.

2) There are in the first chapter of Genesis 454 syllables ending with a vowel, including those ending with a quiescent letter. Of these, 181 are accented, 273 unaccented (the Méthég̃h not being regarded as an accent). In all grammars the law is laid down that unaccented simple (or open) syllables must have a long vowel; but of the 273 unaccented syllables, 39, i. e., one in seven, has a short vowel. There is, of course, a clear reason in every case for this seeming violation of the rule. But why, when so large a number of such cases occurs, should no mention be made of them?

3) That student who fails to notice this deviation, and to classify the instances of it, cannot be called a critical student. That teacher who will not take into account a fact which, in violation of a most fundamental principle, occurs at least twenty times on every page of the Hebrew Bible, is not a critical teacher.

4) In our study of the Hebrew upon the basis of the Massoretic punctuation, we find, as a matter of fact, repeated instances of unaccented syllables ending in a short vowel. Why not, for the sake of convenience, designate these syllables by some definite and appropriate term? Professor Green has used the expression "intermediate;" Gesenius (Kautzsch) "half-open;" Strack suggests for some "loosely closed," for others, "opened." For our own part, any one of these terms would be satisfactory.

[In the article on "The Aramaic Language," § 1, the spelling "Shemitic" was allowed to stand, by an oversight, instead of "Semitic." Hereafter ך̣ will be transliterated by w, and ך̣ by š.—*Ed.*]

▷BOOK NOTICES.◁

KAUTZSCH'S GRAMMAR OF THE BIBLICAL-ARAMAIC.*

This is a complete *Reference*-grammar for *Biblical-Aramaic*, and will make a convenient companion volume to the edition of Gesenius's Hebrew Grammar by the *same author*. It is about half as large as that work, and follows, in the main, the arrangement pursued there. The Introduction (a translation of which is given in this number) contains twenty-three pages; Orthography comprises seventeen pages; Etymology, ninety-one; and Syntax, forty-one. The real excellence of the book consists in the thoroughness with which the comparison with Hebrew is maintained, and differences noted, and in the free communication of the author's opinion on difficult questions. In dealing with the latter, everything which may shed light upon the matter in hand seems to have been consulted. The Index to Scripture passages shows that all but forty-seven Aramaic verses have been cited in the body of the work, and one passage has eleven such references.

For details, it may be sufficient to refer to what our author has done for the noun. This subject, so difficult of treatment and, hitherto, so loosely treated, is here handled with scientific accuracy and with a fullness never attempted. Forty pages, more than half of them in minion type, are given to the Etymology alone. In this division of the grammar, the Biblical citations are very numerous, at least one passage being referred to in the case of every form, and all forms occurring in Biblical Aramaic are said by the author to be enumerated in the classification which he gives. The general method of classification is like that in Gesenius, except that feminine nouns of a particular class are discussed with the masculines of the same class. Many interesting facts are here brought into prominence, as, e. g., in the statement, on p. 84, that הַ of the fem. and emph. masc. is not used by Hebraism for הָ, but is to be regarded as just as good Aramaic and at least as old as the latter; and in the one on page 91, that forms like צִלְם are really Segholates of the A-Class, while forms like עֵשֶׁב are I-Class Segholates. The remarks on *foreign* words, though brief, are, for the most part, satisfactory. In the discussion of the noun, as everywhere else in the book, forms not actually occurring in the Bible are distinguished by a special sort of type.

The Syntax of the Noun may be so estimated by the following list of sections printed in the contents. They are:—The Genders; The Numbers; The Emphatic State; The representation of the Genitive relation by the so-called Const. State; The Genitive by circumlocution with הַי; The Noun in exclamation; The Noun in apposition; The Noun governed by Verbs; The Adjective as attributive and the expression of it by circumlocution; The Numerals.

For purposes of *reference* the volume before us renders all other books of the sort well nigh useless, so far as concerns *Biblical Aramaic*; and the author deserves the thanks of all friends of Semitic study.

C. R. B.

* GRAMMATIK DES BIBLISCH-ARAMAÏSCHEN, MIT EINER KRITISCHEN EROERTERUNG DER ARAMAÏSCHEN WOERTER IM NEUEN TESTAMENT. Von E. Kautzsch, Ord. Professor der Theologie in Tuebingen. VIII and 182 pp. Leipzig: F. C. W. Vogel, 1884.

BROWN'S ARAMAIC METHOD.*

In the title to his work, Professor Brown seems to have been obliged to choose between unscientific inaccuracy and a correctness that is slightly indefinite. For he has rejected the old, but really inaccurate, name of Chaldee, and substituted for it the more correct, but also more indefinite name Aramaic. Yet his book is only designed to be an introduction to the more thorough study of the so-called Chaldee of the Bible and the Targums. It is not easy to see, however, how one possessed of the scholarly spirit of which Professor Brown's book gives evidence, could have done otherwise.

It is certainly to be regretted that we cannot have some name more true to the philological facts of the case than the old name of Chaldee, by which to distinguish the language of the Targums from that other offshoot from the old common stock, i. e. the language, or dialect, known as the Syriac.

Professor Brown's excellent book consists substantially of three parts; (1) Selections from the Targums, (2) scholarly and helpful Notes on these selections, and also on the Aramaic portions of the Old Testament (for the text of these the student is referred to the Hebrew Bible), and (3) a carefully prepared Vocabulary. Thus the book is essentially, as is stated in the Preface, a Reading Book, or Chrestomathy. The Preface also informs us that it is only the First Part of a work yet to be completed by the issue of Part II, which will consist of a Grammar. The Chrestomathy is published before the Grammar, because the design of Professor Brown is that his completed work shall be used in the "acquisition of the elements of Aramaic by the so-called *Inductive Method*." In this method, the student is first led to see the facts in the language itself, and learns the principles and laws underlying these facts afterwards.

To aid in the accomplishment of his purpose, Professor Brown has printed in his book the text of the first ten chapters of the Targum of Onkelos, with the corresponding portions of the Hebrew text on the opposite pages. By this means, the student will be able, with the help of a skilful instructor, to discover for himself all the important resemblances and differences between the Hebrew and the Chaldee, and thus become prepared for a systematic study of the Chaldee Grammar. As a partial compensation for the yet unpublished Part II, Professor Brown has inserted in this Part I, before the title page, a complete set of Chaldee paradigms, so that the book, as it now stands, will form, in the hands of a competent teacher, a complete apparatus for giving the student command of the Aramaic portions of the Old Testament, and such a knowledge of the language of the Targums, as will fit him to enter upon the more thorough study of them.

The print, both English and square character (Hebrew and Chaldee) is good and clear, and the appearance of the pages is very pleasing to the eye. To those who know anything of the difficulty of securing good work of this sort in our country, the press-work reflects no small credit upon the publishers.

Professor Brown has made a real and valuable contribution to the study of the so-called Chaldee; and one proof of the excellence of his work is, that his book already, so soon after its publication, has been adopted as a text-book in at least five important Theological Seminaries.

S. B.

* AN ARAMAIC METHOD, a Class-Book for the study of the Elements of Aramaic from Bible and Targums, by Charles R. Brown. Part I. Text, Notes, and Vocabulary. Chicago: American Publication Society of Hebrew, Morgan Park, 1884.

»SEMITIC BIBLIOGRAPHY.«

- AMAND, A. Quelques observations sur les inscriptions des statues de Tell-Lah. *Ztschr. f. Keilschriftforsch.*, April '84.
- BACHER, W. Die Hebräisch-Arabische Sprachvergleichung d. Abulwalid Mer-Wân ibn Ganâh. Wien: *Gerold's Sohn*.....M.1.20
- BADGER, G. P. An English-Arabic Lexicon. London: *Paul Trench & Co.* .80s.
- BASSETT, J. Grammatical note on the Simnûnî dialect of the Persian Language. *Journ. Roy. Asiatic Soc.*, Jan., '84.
- BERGAIGNE, A. Manuel pour étudier la Langue Sanscrite. Chrestomathie, lexique, principes de grammaire. *Vieweg*.....12fr.
- BERGK, T. Zur Geschichte des griechischen Alphabete in Pamphylien. *Ztschr. f. Numismatik*, XI, 4.
- BERLINER, A. Beiträge zur Geographie und Ethnographie Babyoniens im Talmud und Midrash. (By Kroner.) *Juedisches Litteratur-Blatt*, July 31, '84.
- BERLINER, A. Targum Onkelos. Herausgegeben und erläutert. I. Thl. Text, nach Editio Sabioneta d. J. 1557. II. Thl. Noten, Einleitung und Register. Mit Unterstützung der k. Academie der Wissenschaften in Berlin. Berlin: *Gorzelauczyk & Co.*, 1884.....M.10.—
- BERLINER, A. Targum Onkelos. (By G. F. Moore.) *Andover Review*, Oct., '84.
- BLOCH, J. S. Beiträge zur Einleitung in die Talmudische Literatur. Einblicke in die Geschichte der Entstehung der Talmudischen Literatur. Wien, D. Löwy. Gr. 8vo, pp. x, 139.
- BROWN, C. R. An Aramaic Method. A Class-Book for the study of the Elements of Aramaic from Bible and Targums. Part I. Text, Notes and Vocabulary. Chicago: *American Publication Society of Hebrew*, 1884.....\$1.75
- DELITZSCH, FRIEDR. Hebrew Language viewed in light of Assyrian Research. (By H. L. Strack.) *Theol. Litbl.*, 25.
- DUVAL, R. Sur la contrée araméenne, appelée pays supérieur, par les lexico-graphes syriaques. *Journ. Asiatique*, Feb., Mar. '84.
- DVORAK, RUD. Ueber "tinûru" des Assyrisch-Babylonischen and die entsprechenden Formen der übrigen semitischen Sprachen. *Ztschr. f. Keilschriftforschung*, April, '84.
- FISCHER, B. Talmudische Chrestomathie. (By H. L. Strack.) *Theol. Litbl.*, 24.
- GAINET. Le déluge de Noé et les terrains quaternaires des geologues. Besançon: *Jacquin*. 8vo, pp. XLII, 194.
- GENZ, H. Die Lokalkenntniss der Bibel. Anklam: 1884. 8vo, pp. iv, 39. M.—.50
- GESENIUS, W. Hebräisches und chaldäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament. 9. Aufl. v. F. Mühlaus u. W. Volck. (By H. L. Strack.) *Theol. Litbl.* 22; (By P. de Lagarde.) *Gött. gel. Anz.*, 7; (By C. Siegfried.) *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, Sept. 6.
- GUYARD, ST. Une nouvelle racine assyrienne; barû. *Journ. Asiatique*, Feb., Mar., '84.
- GUYARD, ST. Questions suméro-accadiennes. *Ztschr. f. Keilschriftforsch.* Apr. '84.
- HALEVY, J. Coup d'oeil retrospectif sur l'alphabet libyque. *Journ. Asiatique*, Feb., Mar., '84.
- HARING, I. Die ענייִם und ענייִם im Alten Testament. *Theol. Studien aus Wuertemberg*, 1884, 2.

- HARTMANN, M. Presserzeugnisse Syriens in den Jahren 1882–83. *Literatur-Bl. f. Orient. Philol.*, March, '84.
- HEIDENHEIM, M. Bibliotheca Samaritana. Herausgegeben und mit Einleitung, textkritischen Noten, Scholien und Beilagen versehen. I. Leipzig: O. Schulze.....M.3.50
- HIRSCH, S. R. Ueber die Beziehung des Talmuds zum Judenthum und zu der sozialen Stellung seiner Bekenner. Frankfurt: *Kauffmann*, 1884. 8vo, pp. 38.
- HOMMEL, FRITZ. Die sumero-akkadische Sprache und ihre Verwandtschaftsverhältnisse. *Ztschr. f. Keilschriftforsch.*, April, July, '84.
- KAUTZSCH, E. Uebungsbuch zu Gesenius-Kautzsch' Hebräischer Grammatik. Leipzig: *F. C. W. Vogel*, 1884, pp. 162.
- KAUTZSCH, E. Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen mit einer kritischen Erörterung der aramäischen Wörter im Neuen Testament. Leipzig: *F. C. W. Vogel*. Gr. 8., pp. VIII, 181.....M.4
- KREMER, A. FRHR. v. Beiträge zur arabischen Lexicographie. II. [Aus: "Sitzungsber. der k. Akad. der Wissensch."] Wien: *Gerold's Sohn*.....78s.
- KREMP, F. Hebräische Studien. Gymasialprogramm. Rastatt, 1883.
- LANMAN, C. R. A Sanskrit Reader, with Vocabulary and Notes. Parts I. and II. Texts and Vocabulary. Boston: *Ginn & Heath*, 1884.
- LEVY, J. Neuhebräisches und chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Talmudin und Midraschim. (By S. Fraenkel.) *Lit.-Bl. f. Orient. Philol.*, Aug., '84.
- LYON, D. G. Keilinschrifttexte Sargon's, Königs von Assyrien. (By J. P. Taylor.) *Andover Review*, June, '84.
- MITCHELL, E. C. Elementary Hebrew Grammar and Reading Book. Andover: *W. F. Draper*, 1884, pp. 120.....\$1.25
- MITCHELL, H. G. Hebrew Lessons: a book for beginners. Boston: *Ginn, Heath & Co.*, 1884. Pp. 232.....\$1.80
- PREISWERK, D. S. Grammaire hébraïque. 4 éd., refondue par Past. S. Preiswerk. Avec un tableau comparatif des alphabets. Basel: *Georg*. Gr. 8., pp. LXVI, 402.
- RAMMELT, G. Ueber die zusammengesetzten Nomina im Hebräischen. (Hallenser Dissertation, 1883.) Leipzig: *Fock*. 8vo, pp. 32.....M.1.—
- REDHOUSE, J. W. A simplified Grammar of the Ottoman-Turkish Language. London: *Truebner & Co.*, Post 8vo, pp. 216.
- SAYCE, A. H. The literary works of Ancient Babylonia. *Ztschr. f. Keilschriftf.*, July, '84.
- SCHRADER, E. Zur Frage nach dem Ursprunge der altbabylonischen Cultur. Berlin: *Duemmler*, 1884. Gr. 4to, pp. 49.
- SCHRADER, E. Kineladan und Asurbanipal. *Ztschr. f. Keilschriftforsch.*, July, '84
- STRACK, H. L. Lehrbuch der neuhebräischen Sprache und Literatur. *Modern Review*, July, '84.
- STRACK, H. L. Hebräische Grammatik. (By H. Vuilleumier.) *Revue de Theol. et de Phil.*, July, '84; (By E. Nestle.) *Lit. Centralbl.*, 25.
- STRASSMAIER, S. J. Fünf babylonische Verträge aus der Zeit von Nebukad-nezzar. *Ztschr. f. Keilschriftforschung*, April, '84.
- VOSEN, C. H. Rudimenta linguae hebraicae publicis et domesticae disciplinae brevissime accommodata. Retractavit, auxit, sextum emendatissima ed. Dr. Fr. Kaulen. Freiberg: *Herder*. Gr. 8vo, pp. IV, 131.
- ZOECKLER, O. Luther als Ausleger des Alten Testaments, gewürdigt auf Grund seines grösseren Genesis-Commentars. Greifswald: *Abel*, 1884. 8vo, pp. 77. M.1